

FY 2005 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE Plan

U.S. Department of Education
February 2, 2004

This page left intentionally blank

Contents

Introduction.....	Page 1
Key to Program Legislation.....	1
Program Reports by Goal	3 - 218

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
CRA: Training and Advisory Services	<u>Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Centers Program)</u>	1
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	<u>21st Century Community Learning Centers</u>	2
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing	<u>Advanced Credentialing Program</u>	6
ESEA: Advanced Placement	<u>Advanced Placement Incentives Program</u>	7
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity	<u>Alaska Native Education Program</u>	9
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	<u>Public Charter Schools Program</u>	10
ESEA: Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>Civic Education</u>	12
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	<u>Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program</u>	14
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	<u>Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program</u>	16
ESEA: Early Reading First	<u>Early Reading First</u>	18
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians	<u>Native Hawaiian Education Program</u>	20
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	<u>Enhancing Education Through Technology Program</u>	22

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: English Language Acquisition State Grants	<u>OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III)</u>	25
ESEA: Impact Aid--Basic Support Payments	<u>Impact Aid</u>	27
ESEA: Impact Aid—Payments for Children with Disabilities	<u>Impact Aid</u>	27
ESEA: Impact Aid--Construction	<u>Impact Aid</u>	27
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	<u>Improving Teacher Quality State Grants</u>	29
ESEA: Indian Education—Grants to Local Educational Agencies	<u>Indian Education</u>	31
ESEA: Indian Education—Special Programs for Indian Children	<u>Indian Education</u>	31
ESEA: Literacy through School Libraries	<u>Improving Literacy Through School Libraries</u>	36
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	<u>Magnet Schools Assistance Program</u>	37
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships	<u>Mathematics and Science Partnerships</u>	39
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program	<u>Migrant Education</u>	41
ESEA: National Writing Project	<u>National Writing Project</u>	46
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program	<u>Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D)</u>	47
ESEA: Reading First State Grants	<u>Reading First State Grants</u>	50
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/ Inexpensive Book Distribution (FIE)	<u>Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution</u>	53
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	<u>Ready-to-Learn Television</u>	54
ESEA: Rural Education Program	<u>Rural Education Achievement Program</u>	57
ESEA: State Assessments	<u>State Assessments</u>	58

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	<u>Innovative Education State Grants</u>	60
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History	<u>Teaching of Traditional American History</u>	61
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	<u>Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA</u>	62
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	<u>Transition To Teaching</u>	65
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	<u>Troops To Teachers</u>	67
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	<u>Voluntary Public School Choice Program</u>	68
ESRA: National Assessment	<u>National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment</u>	69
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	<u>High School Equivalency Program</u>	72
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	<u>Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants</u>	73
IDEA: Grants for Infants and Families	<u>IDEA Part C -- Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities</u>	75
IDEA: Grants to States	<u>IDEA Part B Grants to States</u>	79
IDEA: Parent Information Centers	<u>IDEA Part D - Parent Information Centers</u>	86
IDEA: Personnel Preparation	<u>IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation</u>	89
IDEA: Preschool Grants	<u>IDEA Part B Preschool Grants Program</u>	93
IDEA: State Improvement	<u>IDEA Part D - State Improvement</u>	95
IDEA: Technical Assistance and Dissemination	<u>IDEA Part D - Technical Assistance & Dissemination</u>	98
IDEA: Technology and Media Services	<u>IDEA Part D - Technology & Media Services</u>	101

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	<u>McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program</u>	104
USC: American Printing House for the Blind	<u>Special Institutions for Persons with Disabilities American Printing House for the Blind (APH)</u>	106

Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: Character Education (FIE)	<u>Character Education</u>	110
ESEA: Civic Education: We the People	<u>Civic Education</u>	12
ESEA: Physical Education Program – Carol M. White (FIE)	<u>Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP)</u>	111
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Mentoring Program	<u>Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Programs</u>	112
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Other National Programs	<u>Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Programs</u>	112
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—State Grants	<u>Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants Program</u>	115

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination	<u>Research, Development and Dissemination</u>	119
ESRA: Statistics	<u>National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Assessment</u>	69
IDEA: Research and Innovation	<u>IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation</u>	125
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research	<u>National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)</u>	130

Goal 5: Enhance the Quality of and Access to Postsecondary and Adult Education

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants	<u>Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development</u>	138
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities	<u>National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act)</u>	143
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy	<u>National Institute for Literacy</u>	144
ATA: Assistive Technology	<u>Assistive Technology Program</u>	146
EDA: Gallaudet University	<u>Gallaudet University</u>	149
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf	<u>National Technical Institute for the Deaf</u>	154
HEA: AID — Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
HEA: AID -- Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: AID – Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: AID — Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: AID — Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: AID -- Strengthening Institutions (Part A)	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: AID – Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges & Universities	<u>Institutional Development, Title III and Title V</u>	158
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships	<u>Byrd Honors Scholarships Program</u>	160
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents In School	<u>Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program</u>	161
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program	<u>College Assistance Migrant Program</u>	164
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Educational Opportunity Centers	<u>TRIO Programs</u>	166
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement	<u>TRIO Programs</u>	166
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Student Support Services	<u>TRIO Programs</u>	166
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Talent Search	<u>TRIO Programs</u>	166
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Upward Bound	<u>TRIO Programs</u>	166
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	<u>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education</u>	171

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)	<u>Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)</u>	173
HEA: Graduate Assistance In Areas of National Need (GAANN)	<u>Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)</u>	177
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Domestic Programs	<u>International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program</u>	180
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Institute for International Public Policy	<u>International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program</u>	180
MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Overseas Programs	<u>International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program</u>	180
HEA: Javits Fellowships	<u>Javits Fellowship Program</u>	182
HEA/DEOA: SFA -- Student Aid Administration	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans (CHAFL) Federal Administration	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- Federal Direct Student Loans	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
HEA: SFA -- Federal Pell Grants	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- Federal Perkins Loans	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HEA: SFA -- Federal Work-Study	<u>Student Financial Assistance Policy</u>	183
	<u>Student Financial Assistance Programs</u>	189
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults	<u>Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults</u>	191
Howard University	<u>Howard University</u>	194
RA: Client Assistance State Grants	<u>Client Assistance Program (CAP)</u>	200
RA: Independent Living--Centers	<u>Independent Living Services Program</u>	202
RA: Independent Living--Services for Older Blind Individuals	<u>Independent Living Services Program</u>	202
RA: Independent Living--State Grants	<u>Independent Living Services Program</u>	202
RA: Protection and Advocacy	<u>Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR)</u>	204
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs	<u>Demonstration and Training Programs</u>	205
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants for Indians	<u>American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services</u>	207

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants to States	<u>State Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Supported Employment -</u>	208
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training	<u>Training Program</u>	213
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institute	<u>Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions</u>	216

All Goals

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
DEOA: Office for Civil Rights	<u>Office for Civil Rights</u>	221

INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan* form an overarching context of broad outcomes that we believe should characterize American education. We believe that if we are successful, as a whole, we will see increases in the related measures—measures that are in most cases for all children, whether or not they are individually served by our programs. We believe that our success as an agency can be measured in the results of better education for *all*.

However, this kind of information does not always provide us with the tools necessary to determine the success of each of our programs or the relationship between program-specific funding and results. For that, we need measures that are more specific to the provisions of each particular program and to the audience it serves. This, too, is part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Thus, in addition to the measures specified in our *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan*, we have established measures and targets for all of our major programs and many of our smaller programs. In some cases, we have set measures for a particular program individually. In other cases, we have grouped similar programs and set measures for that cluster of programs.

For FY 2005 the Department submitted a Performance Budget. The performance information from this Performance Budget, which includes the Department level Plan and program performance plans, is located on the Department's website at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/index.html>.

This document is a compilation of the program performance plans arranged by goal.

Key to Legislation:

AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
AID = Aid for Institutional Development
ATA = Assistive Technology Act
CRA = Civil Rights Act
DEOA = Department of Education Organization Act
EDA = Education of the Deaf Act
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act
FIE = Fund for the Improvement of Education

HEA = Higher Education Act
HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
RA = Rehabilitation Act
SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act
USC = United States Code

Goal 2

Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Centers Program) - 2005

CFDA Number:

84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

Goal 8: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Training and TA services result in more racial and minority parents using their school choice and supplemental services options under No Child Left Behind.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>An increase in the number of targeted parents whose children participate in school choice and supplemental services.</i>			<p>Progress: Explanation: FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting baseline is 999). Performance targets are set for baseline plus 1%.</p> <p>Explanation: Equity centers provide technical assistance at the LEA level which supports parental choice.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Equity Assistance Center Performance Reports that will identify the number of LEAs receiving assistance that report an increase in racial and ethnic minority parent participation.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		
2006		1		
2007		1		

2005PM

21st Century Community Learning Centers - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.287 - Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers

Goal 8: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards; to offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program; and to offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, or teacher reports.

Targets and Performance Data												Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality	
Percentage of regular program participants whose Math/English grades improved from fall to spring.																Additional Source Information: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.	
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets										
	Middle or Middle High or High Elementary Elementary School School Overall Overall Math English Math English Math English						Middle or Middle High or High Elementary Elementary School School Overall Overall Math English Math English Math English										
2000	43	45	36	37	39	41											
2001	43	46	37	39	40	43	45	45	45	45	45	45					
2002	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45					
2003							45	45	45	45	45	45					
2004							47	47	47	47	47	47					
2005							47	47	47	47	47	47					
Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level																	

Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets					
	Middle or Middle High or High Elementary Elementary School School Overall Overall Math English Math English Math English						Middle or Middle High or High Elementary Elementary School School Overall Overall Math English Math English Math English					
2000	5.80	5.10	3.90	3.90	4.80	4.50						
2001	5	4.10	8.10	5.50	6.60	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
2002	3.70	4	2	3.90	3.70	4.10	6	6	6	6	6	6
2003							6	6	6	6	6	6
2004							6	6	6	6	6	6
2005							6	6	6	6	6	6

Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall
2000	76	64	69			
2001	74	71	73	75	75	75
2002	76.30	73.60	75.50	75	75	75
2003				75	75	75
2004				77	77	77
2005				77	77	77

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior				Explanation: According to teacher reports in 2002 76 percent of the		Additional Source Information: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				

	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	<p>students who regularly participated in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs showed behavioral improvements (up from 74% in 2001).</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. Limitations: Teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and across sites.</p>
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70	
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75	
2002	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75	
2003				75	75	75	
2004				77	77	77	
2005				77	77	77	

Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes such as school attendance and academic performance, and result in decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: More than 85 percent of Centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.</i>				<p>Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. Improvements: Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	97	85		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.80	85		
2003	96.10	85		
2004		95		
2005		100		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Other enrichment activities: More than 85 percent of Centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and physical education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology</i>			Explanation: The vast majority of the centers (96%) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (81 percent) offering computer- or technology-related activities. This is up from 79% in 2001.	Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. Improvements: Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	70	85		
2001	79	85		
2002	80.60	85		
2003	81.30	85		
2004		97		
2005		97		
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	97	85		
2001	95	85		
2002	96	85		
2003	95.90	85		
2004		97		
2005		100		

2005PM

Advanced Credentialing Program - 2005

Goal 8: Support teachers seeking advanced certification through high quality professional teacher enhancement programs designed to improve teaching and learning.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board Certification will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Cumulative number of teachers certified.</i>			Progress: The actual number of National Board Certified Teachers is currently available for 2002. Data for each year normally will be available by the end of November. The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 NBCTs each year. Currently, 49 states and approximately 490 localities offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board Certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board Certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) However, budget shortfalls in the states are having an impact on the incentives offered and thus the number of candidates.	Additional Source Information: Board reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	23,936	22,000		
2003		30,000		
2004		35,000		
2005		40,000		
2006		45,000		
2007		50,000		

2005PM

Advanced Placement Incentives Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

Goal 8: To increase the number of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education

Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students served: The number of low-income students who are successful on AP and IB tests.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) The number of students who demonstrate higher educational achievement for middle and high school students in schools and classrooms served by the API Program as compared to those in control groups.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: New performance measures have been established for (a), (b), (c) and (e). Baseline for these measures is FY'04. Data will be available in December, 2005. Data for (d) is available November 2003. The 2005 target for (a), (b), (c), and (d) is baseline plus 1%. Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		
<i>(b) Percentage of students who demonstrate higher success rates on AP tests for students served by the API Program as compared to those in control groups.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		
<i>(c) Percentage of students who demonstrate higher success rates on IB tests for students served by the API Program as compared to those in control groups.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		
<i>(d) The numbers of AP tests taken by low-income students nationally</i>				

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	92,570	83,300
2000	102,474	102,000
2001	112,891	112,200
2002	140,572	124,180
2003	166,649	154,629
2004		170,092
2005		183,314

<i>(e) Number of IB tests taken by low-income students nationally.</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		1

2005PM

Alaska Native Education Program - 2005

Goal 8: Alaska Native Education Program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>As appropriate an increased percentage of students participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i>			Explanation: FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting baseline is 999). Performance target are set for baseline plus 5%.	Additional Source Information: Grantee performance report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: July 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>As appropriate Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs will improve on measures of school readiness.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle school students in Anchorage School District will decrease.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		

2005PM

Public Charter Schools Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

Goal 8: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from state or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging state performance standards, and are open to all students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)</i>			Status: Target met	Additional Source Information: State Educational Agencies (SEA); state legislatures. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: January 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: There is variation in the definition of charter school and authorizing agency in state charter school legislation.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	12			
1996	19			
1997	27			
1998	31			
1999	38			
2000	38	40		
2001	39	42		
2002	40	42		
2003	41	43		
2004		44		
2005		44		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the nation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of charter schools in operation</i>			Status: Target met Explanation: There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective. The number of charter schools in operation has dramatically	Additional Source Information: Center for Education Reform Annual Survey; State Education Agencies. Frequency: Annually
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	100			

1996	255		increased from 100 in 1994 to 2,700 in 2003.	<p>Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: January 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. On site monitoring by ED and data from the Center for Education Reform</p> <p>Limitations: Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts among SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.</p>
1997	428			
1998	790			
1999	1,100			
2000	1,700	2,060		
2001	2,110	2,667		
2002	2,431	3,000		
2003	2,700	3,000		
2004		3,100		
2005		3,500		

2005PM

Civic Education - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.304 - Cooperative Education Exchange Program
84.929 - We The People

Goal 8: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth national goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.
--

Objective 8.1 of 2: Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Quality of teacher training under the program: The extent to which training under the program has improved the quality of instruction for students			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that will have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation will increase.</i>			Additional Source Information: Grantee evaluations reported via Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		70	
2006		80	
2007		90	

Objective 8.2 of 2: Provide exemplary curricula and teacher training for teachers from emerging democracies under the Cooperative Civic and Economic Education program

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Quality of teacher training: The extent to which training under the program has improved the quality of instruction for students			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities under the program (in the United States and in participating foreign countries) that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction will increase</i>			Additional Source Information: Data will come from program evaluations supported by the grantee. Frequency: Annually
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	

	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2004 Cohort	Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
2005				70	60	50	
2006				80	70	60	
2007				80	70		

2005PM

Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.354 - Charter Schools Facilities Program

Goal 8: Increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Objective 1.1: Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities.</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be collected in 2003 and reported in 2004. The 2004 & 2005 target for this measure is baseline plus 1%. * Definition: Leverage: The number of dollars leveraged consists of the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the Federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the Federal grant. A grantee may count senior debt towards the total amount of funds leveraged if it uses grant funds to guarantee or insure subordinate debt but not the senior debt to which it is tied. Likewise, grantees may count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it only uses grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.	Additional Source Information: Performance Reports Collection Period: - 2003 Data Available: January 2004 Limitations: These multi-year grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data. First reports are due December 2003.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served through this indicator.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

<i>The number of charter schools served through this indicator.</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be collected in 2003 and reported in 2004. The 2004 and 2005 target for this measure is baseline plus 1%.	Additional Source Information: Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - Data Available: January 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

2005PM

Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program - 2005

Goal 8: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 2: Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy rich classrooms.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Apply research-based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy rich classrooms: Average ELLCO score will improve.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ECEPD teachers' scores on ELLCO will improve.</i>			Progress: Teacher performance documentation; documented use of the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO). The target for FY 2005 is baseline + 1%.	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Documentation of application of research-based approaches, as recorded by mentors or supervisors working with participating educators (i.e., logs or reports); pre and post evaluation of educator lesson plans; results of the ELLCO.. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2005. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: May 2004 Limitations: Not all ECEPD grantees use the ELLCO literacy Environment Checklist. Data collected only represent the sample of grantees who use the checklist.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy and numeracy skills.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: At the end of the last preschool year, children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.			Progress: Documented use of Get It Got It GO, the Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3) amd the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III). The target for FY 2005 is baseline + 1%.	Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: Results of Get It Got It GO, DIAL-3, and PPVT-III.. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2005. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: May 2004 Limitations: Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT and the Individual Growth and Development Indicators available from Get It, Got it, Go! Not all ECEPD grantees use the PPVT or the Individual Growth and Development Indicators.		
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	Cognitive	Social / Emotional			Cognitive	Social / Emotional
2004					999	
2005					1	
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.			Progress: Documented use of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Results of DIBELS.. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2005. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: May 2005		
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
2005					999	

2005PM

Early Reading First - 2005

CFDA Number: [84.359](#) - Early Reading First

Goal 8: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy, and prereading development of preschool age children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and pre-reading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language, and alphabet knowledge.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percent of 4 year old children participating in ERF programs who achieve age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.</i>			<p>Progress: Data from SY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting the baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline + 1%.</p> <p>Explanation: The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees is FY 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a post-test after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Post-test scores of ERF preschool children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher.</p>	<p>Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Early Reading First Annual Performance Report. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: March 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.</p> <p>Limitations: Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT. Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PPVT to measure cognitive development.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Receptive	Receptive		
2004		999		
2005		1		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Alphabet Knowledge: The score ERF children attain on the Letter Naming Task.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	

The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the Letter Naming Task			<p>Progress: Data from FY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%.</p> <p>Explanation: Fy 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report will be due December 2004. The Letter Naming Task is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report.</p>	<p>Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: The Early Reading First Performance Report.. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: March 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>The Letter Naming Task is a measure that has been normed using a national sample from the Head Start population. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.</p> <p>Limitations: Not all Early Reading First grantees use the Letter Naming Task to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the Letter Naming Task.</p> <p>Improvements: Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the Letter Naming Task as the measure of alphabet knowledge.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

2005PM

Native Hawaiian Education Program - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.209 - Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers
84.210 - Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented
84.221 - Native Hawaiian Special Education
84.296 - Native Hawaiian Community-Based Education Learning Centers
84.297 - Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment
84.316 - Native Hawaiian Higher Education Pr
84.362 - Native Hawaiian Education

Goal 8: Native Hawaiian Education Program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support innovative projects that provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>As appropriate the percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants will increase.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Progress: Baseline will be established in FY 2004. 999 is used to set the baseline. The 2005 Target is baseline plus 5 percent.	Additional Source Information: Grantee performance report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: July 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>An increased percentage of Native Hawaiian children who participate in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>As appropriate an increased percentage of student participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

2005		5		
2006		5		

2005PM

Enhancing Education Through Technology Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.318 - Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants

Goal 8: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Fully integrate technology into the curricula and instruction in all schools by December 31, 2006 (FY 2007) to enhance teaching and learning. .

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Curriculum Integration: The percentage of districts receiving EETT funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology, as identified by States will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of districts receiving sufficient EETT funds that have integrated technology.</i>			Explanation: FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); performance targets beyond 2004 will be set from the baseline. Performance target for 2005 will be the baseline plus 5%.	Source: Other Other: National Evaluation. Sponsor: PPSS - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).. Date Sponsored: 06/06/2003. Additional Source Information: State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), Consolidated Performance Report; Program Monitoring. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: November 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		

Objective 8.2 of 3: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have comparable access to educational technology as students and teachers in other schools.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty classrooms: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentane of classrooms with internet access</i>		Source 1: NCES Survey/Assessment

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms
2004			100	100
2005			100	100

Explanation: The number of high-poverty schools with Internet access continues to rise. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.

Survey/Assessment: Fast Response Survey System.
References: NCES Study - Internet Access in U. S. Public Schools and Classrooms..
Source 2: *Other*
Other: National Evaluation.
Sponsor: PPSS- National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).
Date Sponsored: 06/06/2003.

Additional Source Information: Consolidated Performance Report, Program Monitoring

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004
Data Available: October 2005

Limitations: Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.

Objective 8.3 of 3: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and school administrators to develop capacity to effectively integrate technology into teaching and learning.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive funding from the State Grant program, the percentage of teachers that meet their state technology standards will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of teachers that meet state technology standards</i>			<p>Explanation: FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); the performance target for 2005 is the baseline plus 5%.</p>	<p>Source: <i>Other</i> Other: National Evaluation. Sponsor: PPSS - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). Date Sponsored: 06/06/2003.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		

		<p>Additional Source Information: Consolidated Performance Report, Program Monitoring, State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA).</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: November 2005</p>

2005PM

OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.365 - English Language Acquisition Grants

Goal 8: To help limited English proficient students learn English and reach high academic standards

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title III.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: The percentage of states that have aligned English language proficiency standards and assessments in place.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1. Percentage of states that have developed English language proficiency standards			<p>Progress: PM 1 and 2 will be completed in 2004. PM 3 & 4 Projections are based on the current rate of progress made by the States in developing or revising their English language proficiency standards and assessments</p> <p>Explanation: Under NCLB, the Title III language acquisition State Formula Grant program is new for all states in 2002-2003. Under indicator 8.1.1, states are working to develop Standards, select and administer language proficiency assessments, align those standards and assessments, and ultimately link those language proficiency standards to academic content standards. States are expected to have PM 1 & 2 (standards and assessment selection) completed by 2004. The alignment and linking, PM 3 & 4, will require additional time to complete, but states should have those tasks completed by 2006.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Biennial Evaluation Report.</p> <p>Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2003</p> <p>Limitations: Under indicator 8.1.1, PM 1-4, standards and assessments will be developed, aligned and linked to academic content standards to prepare for the actual measurement of student progress which will occur under indicators 8.1.2 & 3. Note, also, that the actual assessment of student performance that is aligned to State standards dependent upon the completion of the standards and assessment alignment activities as noted above under PM 1-4, and for that reason it cannot occur until 2006.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		70		
2004		100		
2. The percentage of states that have selected and administered English language proficiency assessments				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		95		
2004		100		
3. The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) standards with ELP assessments				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		10		
2004		40		
2005		70		
2006		100		
4. The percentage of states that have demonstrated how their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading				

<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td></td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>40</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>100</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003		10	2004		40	2005		70	2006		100		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2003		10															
2004		40															
2005		70															
2006		100															

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: The percentage of students who attain English language proficiency.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of limited English-proficient students who have received Title III services for three academic years, the percentage who have attained English language proficiency</i>			Progress: The measure is to assess students performance in attaining English proficiency after receiving Title III supported services for 3 years, therefore, reporting will not begin until 2006. Also, the actual assessment of student performance is dependent upon the completion of the standards and assessment alignment activities as noted above under indicator 8.1.1, PM 1-4. States will therefore not be ready to report on student progress until 2006.	Additional Source Information: Biennial Evaluation Report Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: April 2006
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		70		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: The percentage of students who are making progress in attaining English language proficiency.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of limited English proficient students who have received Title III services for three academic years, the percentage who are making progress in attaining English language proficiency.</i>			Progress: This measure is to assess the progress of students after 3 years of services, therefore reporting cannot begin until 2006. Also, the actual assessment of student performance is dependent upon the completion of the standards and assessment alignment activities as noted above under indicator 8.1.1, PM 1-4, and for that reason states will not be ready to make assessments of student progress before 2006.	Additional Source Information: Biennial Evaluation Reports Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: April 2006
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		70		

2005PM

Impact Aid - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.040 - Impact Aid_Facilities Maintenance
84.041 - Impact Aid
84.041C - Impact Aid Construction Grants

Goal 8: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts

Objective 8.1 of 3: Make payments in a timely manner

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percent of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support and Children With Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of applicants paid within 60 days of appropriation.</i>				Additional Source Information: Program office files. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: April 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	75			
1998	87			
1999	13	90		
2000	96	90		
2001	73	90		
2002	63	90		
2003	98	90		
2004		90		
2005		90		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Construction: The percent of the schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate</i>			Additional Source Information: Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: Data are self-reported by Impact Aid applicants. Assessment of the condition of school facilities may differ depending on the judgment of the individual responding.
2000		70		
2001	44	70		
2002	43	70		
2003	47	70		
2004		70		
2005		70		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Make accurate payments

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments, and payments for Children With Disabilities.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments</i>				Additional Source Information: Program office files. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	5	10		
2000	2	10		
2001	10	10		
2002	4	10		
2003	3	10		
2004		10		
2005		10		

2005PM

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

Goal 8: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Show an annual increase in the percentage of highly qualified teachers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in Title I schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I elementary schools.</i>			Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported. FY 2003 data was estimated from State Consolidated plans submitted in Sept. 2003	Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI); 2004-2005 school survey Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	80	999		
2004		85		
2005		90		
2006		95		
2007		100		
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I middle and high schools.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	75	999		
2004		81		
2005		87		
2006		93		
2007		100		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in all schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools and in all middle and high schools.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools.</i>			Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be	Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2003	85	999	determined after baseline data are reported. Data from 30 states provided in Consolidated Plan Updates (September 2003).	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004
2004		89		
2005		93		
2006		97		
2007		100		
Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all middle and high schools.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	80	999		
2004		85		
2005		90		
2006		95		
2007		100		

2005PM

Indian Education - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Goal 8: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.

Objective 8.1 of 3: American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i>			Explanation: NAEP Assessments for reading and math are not administered annually. National trends indicate performance in reading and math are declining.	Source: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Additional Source Information: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997.
2000	63			Frequency: Biennially.
2002	51			Collection Period: 2003
2003	47	52		Data Available: October 2004
2005		53		Validated By: NCES.
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i>				Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	61			
2003	57	62		
2005		63		
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP</i>				Limitations: The small sample (for the sub-population of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	57			
2000	40			
2003	64	65		

2005		66		
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	51			
2000	47			
2003	52	53		
2005		54		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by states.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in schools who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math		Explanation: No data available	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs.	
Year	Actual Performance		Additional Source Information: Performance Consolidated State Reports, Title I Section.	
2003			Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003	
2004			Data Available: October 2004	
2005			Validated By: No Formal Verification.	
			Limitations: Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.	
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student promotion and graduation: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will graduate at rates comparable to all students.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	

Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Natives 20 to 24 years old who are high school graduates			<p>Explanation: Projects are targeting services to reduce dropouts and increase the graduation rates of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Increased promotion and graduation completion are expected. Unable to locate any specific racial/ethnic data on educational attainment from 2000 census data on website. Only total U.S. data are reported.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: OIE Annual Performance Report</p> <p>Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: July 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedures applied. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics.</p> <p>Limitations: Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	70			
2000		60		
2001		61		
2003		62		
2004		63		
2005		64		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native														
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
Percentage of principals in public schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students														
<table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Principals</td><td>Principals</td></tr> <tr> <td>2003</td><td></td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>20</td></tr> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Principals	Principals	2003		18	2005		20	<p>Status: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: Data is being collected</p> <p>Explanation: Projects for pre-service teacher training began in FY 2000 and are being completed in FY 2003. Three-year projects for pre-service administrative training were only funded in FY 2001 and will be completed in FY 2004.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: OIE Project Performance Reports; Schools and Staffing Survey 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01)</p> <p>Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: June 2004 Validated By: NCES.</p> <p>Limitations: Sample size is small and it is costly to add supplemental</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
	Principals	Principals												
2003		18												
2005		20												
Percentage of teachers in public schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students														

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		<p>samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under representation in sample count.</p> <p>Improvements: Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEA's reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.</p>
	Teachers	Teachers		
2002		20		
2003		21		
2004		22		
2005		23		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian children and adults.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Increasing percentages of pre-school American Indian and Alaska Native students will possess school readiness skills gained through a scientifically-based research designed curriculum that prepares them for kindergarten

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: Data collection for new program will begin in FY 2004	Additional Source Information: OIE Project Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Validated By: No Formal Verification. Office of Indian Education performance report data supplied by grantees Limitations: Substantial variation will exist in curriculum benchmarks and assessments.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		45		
2005		46		
<i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		45		
2005		46		
<i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		45		
2005		46		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduates will increase competency and skills in challenging subject matters, including mathematics and science, to enable successful transition to post-secondary education.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of high school students achieving educationally significant increases in challenging core subject courses.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: Data collection for new program will begin in FY 2004	Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Validated By: No Formal Verification. Office of Indian Education performance report data supplied by grantees Limitations: Substantial variation may exist in methods used to assess student performance.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		45		
2005		46		
<i>Percentage of high school students achieving educationally significant gains on an assessment of college readiness</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		45		
2005		46		

2005PM

Improving Literacy Through School Libraries - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

Goal 8: To improve literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: School/District/State Reading Assessments: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.</i>			Explanation: The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The 2005 target is baseline plus 1 percent.	Additional Source Information: Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and non-participating schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Difference in rate of increase between participating schools and non-participating schools.</i>			Explanation: The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The 2005 target is baseline plus 1 percent.	Additional Source Information: Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

2005PM

Magnet Schools Assistance Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

Goal 8: Students have access to high quality education in desegregated magnet schools.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool in relation to the general student population in the school reduces, eliminates or prevents minority group isolation increases annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.</i>			Progress: Note: MSAP grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees are established with the 2004-05 school year and with the 2007-08 school year. 2008 begins a new cycle, with the expectation that the starting point for performance targets will be higher than the previous starting point, but will not build directly on 2007 results because the participating schools will be different.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report. Additional Source Information: MSAP Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Data Available: October 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: Data are self reported.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Magnet school students meet their State's academic achievement standards.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the State's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed State annual progress standard</i>			Progress: Note: Baseline for schools in the three year grants beginning with the 2004-05 school	Additional Source Information: Annual state test results required by NCLB
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>999</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	year will be performance data from the year prior to the grant (i.e., 2004 spring test results); similarly, the baseline for projects beginning with the 2008-09 school year will be results from schools selected to participate in these projects for spring 2008 test results.	Data Available: October 2006 State educational agencies Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the State's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<i>The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the State's annual yearly progress standard.</i>	Progress: The 2004-05 school year will be performance data from the year prior to the grant (i.e. 2004 spring test results); similarly, the baseline for projects beginning with the 2008-09 school year will be results from schools selected to participate in these projects for spring 2008 test results.	Additional Source Information: State test results required by NCLB Frequency: Annually. Data Available: October 2006 State educational agencies. Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.						
<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>999</td></tr></table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999
Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
2005		999						

2005PM

Mathematics and Science Partnerships - 2005

Goal 8: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified math and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs.

Objective 8.1 of 2: To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase knowledge of mathematics and science.</i>			Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is baseline +20%.	Additional Source Information: Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership Projects. Frequency: Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		20		
2006		10		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of highly qualified middle school (Grades 6-8) teachers.</i>			Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is baseline + 20%.	Additional Source Information: Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership projects. Frequency: Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		20		
2006		10		
<i>Percentage of highly qualified high school (Grades 9-12) teachers.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		20		
2006		10		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To increase the percentage of students in classrooms whose teachers are participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs who score at the proficient or advanced level in mathematics and science on state assessments.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on State mathematics assessments.			
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress
<i>Percentage increase of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.</i>			Explanation: The performance target will be based on the percentage of students reaching the proficiency level of state tests.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2004		999	
2005		5	
2006		5	
			Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; PBDMI Frequency: Annually.
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on science assessments.			
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress
<i>Percentage of students at proficient or advanced levels in science.</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be established in 2005 based on the funded projects' performance measures. Targets will be set on those data that are collected and analyzed.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	
2006		5	
2007		5	
			Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; PBDMI

2005PM

Migrant Education - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education_State Grant Program

Goal 8: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Along with other Federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Reading at the elementary level for migrant students</i>				Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.		Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems. Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	
1996	4	10	50			
1997	4	15	50			
1998	7	18	50			
1999	2	19	50			
2000	5	26	50			
2001	6	23	50			
2002				8	27	
2003				10	32	
2004				14	36	
2005				16	38	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.											
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Middle, for migrant students					Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.			Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems. Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.			
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets							
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target						States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	2	10	50								
1997	3	15	50								
1998	6	18	50								
1999	4	18	50								
2000	2	23	50								
2001	7	21	50								
2002				9						25	50
2003				11						29	50
2004				15						32	50
2005				17						34	50
Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.											
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Elementary, for migrant students.					Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.			Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004			
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets							
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target						States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient

	proficient			results above proficient			<p>Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p> <p>Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>
1996	4	10	50				
1997	5	15	50				
1998	9	18	50				
1999	6	19	50				
2000	7	25	50				
2001	10	23	50				
2002				12	27	50	
2003				14	32	50	
2004				18	36	50	
2005				20	38	50	
Indicator 8.1.4 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.							
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Middle, for migrant students.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	
1996	3	10	50				
1997	3	15	50				
1998	7	18	50				
1999	4	18	50				
2000	2	22	50				
				Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.			Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report
							Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004
							Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB

<table><tr><td>2001</td><td>4</td><td>20</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td></td><td></td><td>62450</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td></td><td></td><td>82850</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td></td><td>123250</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td></td><td>143450</td></tr></table>			2001	4	20	50	2002			62450	2003			82850	2004			123250	2005			143450		limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems. Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.
2001	4	20	50																					
2002			62450																					
2003			82850																					
2004			123250																					
2005			143450																					

Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Reducing Dropout Rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who dropout from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).									
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality				
<i>Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- Dropout Rate for migrant students.</i>			Explanation: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. The 2005 target is baseline plus 1 percent.		Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed). Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Limitations: Data on the number of high school migrant dropouts is not available currently. Improvements: An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who drop out of school between the grades 7 through 12 annually.				
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets			
	States meeting target	States that reported results				Percent of students who drop out of school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who drop out of school
2004							999	999	999
2005							1	1	1

Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Achieving High School Graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- High School Graduation for migrant students</i>			Explanation: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. The target for 2005 is baseline		Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed).

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school
2004				999	999	999
2005				1	1	1

plus one percent.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: December 2004

Limitations: Data on the number of migrant who graduate from high school is not available currently.

Improvements: An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who graduate from high school annually.

2005PM

National Writing Project - 2005

Goal 8: To improve the quality of student writing and learning

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers. NWP sites will develop methods to assess student writing.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students taught by NWP teachers will show improved student writing skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical and those students who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling will increase.</i>			Progress: Data will be available annually by 2004. Progress will be reported each June. 2004 data will be used as baseline data and succeeding years will be used to measure progress. In the interium the target for 2005 is baseline plus 1 percent.	Additional Source Information: Sites will determine assessment instruments to be used (possible examples are Academy for Educational Development-derived tests and the NAEP Test of Writing) in cooperation with the NWP Research Division. Data Available: June 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

2005PM

Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.013 - Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children

Goal 8: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education or obtain employment.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Progress and achievement: The percent of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, or obtaining employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of N or D students obtaining diploma, diploma equivalent, or employment will increase.</i>			<p>Progress: FY 2002-2003 data will serve as baseline data for this indicator. (Note: 999 is the code for setting baseline.) The performance targets for out years are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of out year targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline.</p> <p>Explanation: This indicator was a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Data will be collected through a State performance report which includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p>Improvements: Data collected for 2003 provided the baseline. New data are collected annually; targets are based on baseline data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		5		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: High school course credits: The number of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Average number of high school course credits earned by N or D students will increase.			<p>Progress: FY 2002-2003 data will serve as baseline data for this indicator. (Note: 999 is the code for setting baseline.) The performance targets for out years are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of out year targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline.</p> <p>Explanation: This indicator was a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Data will be collected through a State performance report which includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p>Improvements: Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		5		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D students that improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.			<p>Progress: FY 2002-2003 data will serve as baseline data for this indicator. (Note: 999 is the code for setting baseline.) The performance targets for out years are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of out year targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline.</p> <p>Explanation: This indicator was a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003</p> <p>Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		5		

			success.	Improvements: Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.
Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Transition plan: The percent of students who have a high quality transition plan will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of N or D students with transition plans to return to local school programs.</i>			<p>Progress: FY 2002-2003 data will be sampled from states with state agencies capable of producing this data.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new measure for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Data will be collected through a State performance report which includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003</p> <p>Limitations: Data from State assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p>Improvements: Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		5		

2005PM

Reading First State Grants - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.357 - Reading First State Grants

Goal 8: To improve kindergarten through third grade student achievement in reading by supporting State and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective 8.1 of 3: To increase the percentage of students that learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of students in Reading First schools in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding proficient level in reading.</i>							Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.			Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report Additional Source Information: Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit Annual Performance Reports on reading results for students in grades 1, 2, and 3. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.		
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets								
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3						
2003				999	999	999						
2004				1	1	1						
2005				1	1	1						

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools for At-Risk Students: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 at-risk Reading First students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of at-risk RF students in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding proficient level in reading.</i>							Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.			Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification		
Year		Actual Performance			Performance Targets							
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3						
2003				999	999	999						

2004		1	1	1		
2005		1	1	1		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Reading Achievement Statewide: Increased percentages of students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level on the NAEP reading assessment.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students at proficiency or above on NAEP 4th grade reading assessment.						Source: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress. Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: NCES.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
2000	29					
2002		30				
2003		31				
2005		32				

Objective 8.2 of 3: To decrease the percentage of kindergarten through third grade students in schools participating in Reading First who are referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Referrals to Special Education: Decreasing percentages of RF K-3 students will be referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of RF K-3 students referred for special education services.</i>			Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.		Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report Additional Source Information: Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit an Annual Performance Report that includes data for this indicator. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
2003		999				
2004		1				
2005		1				

Objective 8.3 of 3: To advance the success of the Reading First program by monitoring the progress of states in implementing their approved state plans.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of States that demonstrate progress in implementing approved Reading First plans.</i>			Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

2005PM

Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - 2005

Goal 8: To motivate low income children to read.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low income children, their families, and service providers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: RIF will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.</i>			Explanation: 2003 establishes the baseline year. The target for 2004 is baseline plus 5 percent. The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 15 percent.	Additional Source Information: Grantee performance report Frequency: Annually. Data Available: December 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		10		
2006		15		

2005PM

Ready-to-Learn Television - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

Goal 8: The Ready-to-Learn Television Program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary children.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Children ages 3-6 years old who view literacy based Ready to Learn shows will demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready to Learn television shows that demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills at or above national norms.</i>			Progress: Positive movement towards target is expected. Explanation: Twenty-five percent of Head Start children scored at or above national norms in expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills. Also, children participating in full-year Head Start programs who score at or above national norms for expressive vocabulary and emergent literacy skills can be expected to increase by approximately 9 percent annually. A 5 percent annual increase is ambitious because Ready To Learn services are not "full year" programs comparable to Head Start. Further, the Between the Lions - Mississippi Literacy Initiative: A Report to Mississippi Educational Television suggests that at least some children in the Ready To Learn target populations, particularly Mississippi rural and native American children, tend to achieve at lower baseline levels than comparable populations of children who did participate in the National Head Start study. PBS Ready To Learn services included in this measure have 4 target populations: children with limited literacy, children with disabilities, rural children, and children whose primary language is not English.	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Mathematica- Research Contractor. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: September 2004
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6		Baseline data was available on
2003		30		September 2003 from the Head Start
2004		35		Family and Child Experiences Survey:
2005		40		Longitudinal Findings on Program
<i>(b) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready to Learn television shows that demonstrate emergent literacy skills at or above national norms.</i>			Performance Third Progress Report (January 2001) on which these targets are based. Validated By: Mathematica and reviewed by Department of Education staff.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Limitations: Data is only being collected on preschool children because insufficient funds exist to include elementary school through 3rd grade children. Children included in this sample were selected from those whose parents or child educators attended Ready To Learn workshops.	
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6		
2003		30		
2004		35		
2005		40		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Parents who attend workshops will demonstrate daily reading to their children.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of parents who attend workshops and demonstrate daily reading to their children.</i>			Progress: Positive movement towards the target is expected. Explanation: Baseline- 37% of Head Start parents read to their children on a daily basis. See indicator number one for an explanation of the 5% annual increase. PBS contracts with 148 Ready To Learn stations (PBS affiliates) to conduct workshops, distribute reading materials and newsletters in English and in Spanish, and engage in other ancillary Ready To Learn program activities. This substantive training helps adults extend the educational value of PBS children's programming using the Ready To Learn- Learning Triangle (View, Do, Read).	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Mathematica- Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews.. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Mathematica, contractor and reviewed by Department staff. Limitations: Data collected by contractor is self-reported from parents.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Parents	Parents		
2003		43		
2004		48		
2005		53		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready To Learn Triangle (View, Do, Read).				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready To Learn Triangle following attendance at a Ready To Learn Workshop.</i>			Progress: Positive movement towards target is expected. Explanation: 2003 data will be baseline. The target for 2005 is at least the baseline plus 1 percent. the PBS contracts with 148 Ready To Learn stations (PBS affiliates) to conduct workshops, distribute reading materials and newsletters in English and Spanish, and to engage in other ancillary Ready To Learn program activities. The Ready To Learn "View, Do and Read" Learning Triangle is designed to enhance young children's learning by encouraging them to interact with the people and objects around them. Research shows that some children learn more effectively when they have an opportunity to experience things again and again.	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Mathematica - Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews. Data collected from child educators by phone interviews.. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Mathematica and reviewed by Department staff. Limitations: Data collected by contractor is self-reported by parents and child educators.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Parents and Child Educators	Parents and Child Educators		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

	<p>The Ready To Learn Learning Triangle is also designed to foster improved learning outcomes by encouraging children to play, to manipulate, to group and to repeat each of these activities. Ready To Learn workshops train parents to extend the educational value of children's programming using the Learning Triangle.</p>	
--	--	--

2005PM

Rural Education Achievement Program - 2005

Goal 8: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) participating in Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program, after third year, will make adequate yearly progress.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years..</i>			Explanation: FY 2005 will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999): performance target for FY 2006 will be the baseline data plus 5%.	Additional Source Information: Consolidated Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES & PBDMI Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		5		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) participating in Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program, after third year, will make adequate yearly progress.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.</i>			Explanation: FY 2005 will provide the baseline data. The code for setting baseline data is 999. Performance target for FY 2006 will be the baseline plus 5%.	Additional Source Information: Consolidated Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES & PBDMI Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		5		

2005PM

State Assessments - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.368 - Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments

Goal 8: To support states in the development of state assessments.

Objective 8.1 of 1: By the 2005-2006 school year, all states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school and will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science, all on which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.</i>			Explanation: States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school by 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. 2004 will serve as the baseline year.	Additional Source Information: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; Staff recommendations; and, approval decision by the Secretary Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: September 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.</i>			Explanation: States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school by 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. 2004 will serve as the baseline year.	Additional Source Information: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; Staff recommendations; and, approval decision by the Secretary . Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: September 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		25		
2007		52		
2008		52		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades 3-5, 6-8, and high school).</i>			Explanation: States are not required to have science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school until 2007-2008. This performance measure reflects a long term goal based on requirements set up in NCLB. 2004 will serve as the baseline year.	Additional Source Information: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; Staff recommendations; and, approval decision by the Secretary. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: September 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		21		
2007		25		
2008		52		

2005PM

Innovative Education State Grants - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

Goal 8: To support state and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by U. S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include: (1) Those that support student achievement, enhance reading and math, (2) Those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) Those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) Those that promote access for all students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Title V Funds</i>			Explanation: School Year 2002-2003 data will be used to set the baseline. Performance targets for FY 2004 will be the baseline data plus 5%. FY 2005 performance targets will increase by 1%.	Additional Source Information: State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: November 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Districts targeting Title V Funds (Number, Average % of Districts achieving AYP)	Districts not targeting Title V Funds (Number, Average % of Districts achieving AYP)		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		1		

2005PM

Teaching of Traditional American History - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

Goal 8: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to elementary and secondary level teachers of American history.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for secondary level teachers of American history through the increased achievement of their students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in TAH projects will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control and comparison groups.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.</i>			<p>Progress: For measures (a) and (b): Baseline established in 2004 for at least ten projects.</p> <p>Explanation: The 2005 target for these measures is baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p>Collection Period: 2003 - 2006 Data Available: October 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		
<i>(b) Percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

2005PM

Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.010 - Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Goal 8: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Performance of the lowest-achieving students and students in high poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Student performance on national assessments: The reading performance of low-income 4th grade students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of low-income 4th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in reading on the NAEP.</i>				Explanation: After 2002, NAEP reading switched to odd year administrations to be aligned with the math test. The NAEP reading test is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.		Additional Source Information: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 4th grade Reading Report Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: November 2006 Validated By: NCES.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic	Percentage at or above proficient					Percentage at or above basic
2000	13	39						
2002	16	46	14					40
2003	15	44	15					41
2005			17					43

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Student performance on national assessments: The mathematics performance of low-income 8th grade students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of low-income 8th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in mathematics on the NAEP.</i>				Explanation: The NAEP mathematics for 8th grade students is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.		Additional Source Information: NAEP scores posted on NCES website. Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: November 2006 Validated By: NCES.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic	Percentage at or above proficient					Percentage at or above basic
2001	10	42						
2003	11	47	11					43
2005			13					45

2007		18	50
------	--	----	----

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Student performance on state assessments: States with two years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards will annually report an increase in the number of students in schools with at least 40 percent poverty who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments measures.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States reporting increase in number of low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments			Explanation: This is a new indicator. The long-range target for this indicator is that in five years (2009), 52 states will report an increase in the number of low income students who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments. Baseline data will be collected from the 2003-2004 Consolidated State Report.	Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: March 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		25		
2006		30		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Student performance on state assessments.: States with two years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards will annually report an increase in the number of students in schools with at least 40 percent poverty who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in math on state assessment measures.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States reporting an increase in the number of low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in math on state assessments.			Explanation: This is a new indicator. The long range target for this indicator is that in five years (2009), 52 states will report an increase in the number of low income students who attain either proficient or advanced performane levels in reading on state assessments. Baseline data will be collected through the 2003-2004 Consolidated State report. The target for 2005 is 25 states.	Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: March 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		25		

Objective 8.2 of 2: States and districts will implement standards-based accountability systems and provide effective support for school improvement efforts.			
--	--	--	--

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Schools identified for improvement: The percentage of schools identified for improvement.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of schools identified for improvement will decrease by a rate of 10% annually.			Exnlation: FY 2002-2003 data will be the	Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2003		999	<p>baseline; 2003-2004 data will show a 10% decrease in schools identified for improvement. The number of schools identified for improvement will continue to decline at a 10% rate each year. By 2013, no schools will be identified for improvement.</p>	<p>Management Initiative (PBDMI)</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: June 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p>
2004		10		
2005		10		

2005PM

Transition To Teaching - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

Goal 8: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who become highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of all recruits who become highly qualified teachers and teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs will increase.</i>			Explanation: For measures (a) and (b): Data available: Annually, in November starting in 2003. Progress will be reported annually each November from 2004-2008. For measure (c): Data available annually starting in November 2006. Progress will be reported in 2007 and 2010. Under the Transition program, all participants are required to serve in high need schools in high need LEAs for at least three years. (ED will use the statutory definitions of high need schools and high need LEAs.) Note: For all 2003 baseline data: September 2003 is the end of the first performance period for Transition grantees. Data will be analyzed in November for reports that will be available in October.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: November 2004 Limitations: Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies exist. ED expects to pilot a uniform reporting system in 2004 which will be fully operational in 2005. This system is expected to improve data quality over time but may require adjustments to the performance targets.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	54			
2004		60		
2005		70		
2006		80		
2007		85		
2008		85		
<i>(b) Percentage of all recruits who become highly qualified math or science teachers will increase.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	19			
2004		23		
2005		25		
2006		25		
2007		25		
2008		25		

(c) Percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years will increase.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers who receive full state certification or licensure.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentages of teachers receiving full certification/licensure will increase.			Explanation: Data will be collected in 2004 and reported in 2005. The 2005 target for this measure is baseline plus 1%.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: November 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

2005PM

Troops To Teachers - 2005

Goal 8: To increase the number of military personnel or qualified participants in a reserve component who become highly qualified teachers in high need LEAs and teach for at least three years.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To provide schools in high need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Recruitment: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high need LEAs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified teachers.</i>			<p>Progress: Baseline established in 2003. Progress for target (a) (HQ teachers) will be reported by November 30 in 2005 and 2010. Progress for target (b) (m/s teachers) will be reported annually by November 30 in 2004, 2005, 2006. Progress for target (c) will be reported by November 30 in 2003, 2005, and 2010. (a) The length of time required for recruits to become highly qualified teachers varies. For example, in the baseline year, approximately 29 percent of recruits are pursuing teacher certification but are not yet highly qualified teachers. The actual attrition rate in any year is not expected to exceed 1 percent. (b) The program traditionally prepares a large percentage of special education teachers, which is also a critical need area identified in the authorizing statute. In the baseline year, approximately 18% of recruits became special education teachers.</p> <p>Explanation: The 2004 and 2005 target for these measures is baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p>Additional Source Information: DANTES annual performance reports Collection period: Data on financial stipends: Annually, by fiscal year. Data on teacher placements: Annually, by school year.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually.</p> <p>Data Available: November 2003</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	71	999		
2004		1		
2005		75		
<i>(b) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified math and science teachers.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	26	999		
2004		26		
2005		28		
2006		30		
<i>(c) Percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	99	999		
2005		80		
2006		99		

2005PM

Voluntary Public School Choice Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

Goal 8: To assist States and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.

Objective 8.1 of 1: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases the number of students moving from low performing to higher performing schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of families who exercise public school choice will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) The number of students exercising their choice to transfer from low performing to higher performing schools.</i>			Explanation: Target (a) and target (b) Explanation: A baseline will be set in FY 2003 by October 31, 2003; 2004 - baseline +10%; 2005 - baseline +10%	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: Voluntary Public School Choice Grantee Performance Report. Additional Source Information: COSMOS Corporation, contractor secured through PPSS for the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		10		
2005		10		
<i>(b) The number and percentage of families in each grantee school who exercise school choice will increase annually.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		10		
2005		10		

2005PM

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.830 - Statistics
84.902 - Assessments

Goal 8: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement..

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications</i>				<p>Progress: NCES expects that each year, all user manuals for NCES public-use data files will be available on the web, at least 50 percent of its public use data files will be available on the web, and 75 percent of non-assessment surveys will be administered either through the use of computerized interviews or directly over the web. The efficiency steps will facilitate easier, quicker, and wider access to NCES products</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.</p> <p>Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: 2004 Validated By: NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.</p> <p>Improvements: The NCES Monitoring System will yield annual updates on the use and applications of NCES data. NCES views web release of its reports as a source of increased efficiency and is committed to releasing at least 90 percent of its reports on the web.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility		
1997	88	72	86		
1999	91	77	89		
2001	90	74	90		
2003					
2005					
2007					
<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness			
1997	82	52			
1999	87	67			

2001	88	66	90	90
2003			90	90
2005			90	90
2007			90	90
<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Timeliness	Utility	Timeliness	Utility
1997	89			
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2003			90	90
2005			90	90
2007			90	90

Objective 8.2 of 2: Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind initiative.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The time from the end of data collection to initial public release of results in reading and mathematics assessments shall be reduced from 15 months to 6 months.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of months from end of data collection to initial public release of results.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		6		Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: 2004 Validated By: NCES. Data will be validated by determining number of months between actual end of data collection and the release date. Improvements: NCES has added an additional goal in GPRA "Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative." In addition NCES is
2005		6		
2007		6		

		<p>developing a monitoring system to measure external uses of NCES products. Both volume and actual use will be documented in the monitoring system, for specific user groups. The monitoring system will establish baseline measures of usage and application of NCES products from which long-term outcomes can be established.</p>
--	--	---

2005PM

High School Equivalency Program - 2005

Goal 8: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.

Objective 8.1 of 1: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive their GED.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: GED completion: The percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED</i>			Explanation: The percentage of HEP students who receive the GED decreased for several reasons. First, the GED requirements changed. Secondly, grantees had difficulties getting students tested at GED testing centers. Finally many of the centers were not prepared to test in spanish. In addition new projects experienced difficulties because of late grant notification dates.	Additional Source Information: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	70			
1997	66			
1998	72			
1999	73			
2000	58			
2001	53			
2003		60		
2004		60		
2005		65		

2005PM

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.336 - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

Goal 8: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the skills and knowledge of new teachers by funding the development of state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards and the development of state or local policies/programs that reduce the number of uncertified teachers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Pass rates: Pass rates will increase for preservice teachers taking subject matter competency tests as part of State licensure requirements, in the States that receive funds from the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program for States to prepare teachers that are highly competent in the academic content areas in which they will be teaching (HEA, Title II, Sec. 202 (d) (1)).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of pass rates for preservice teachers taking subject matter competency tests as part of State licensure requirements.</i>			Explanation: 999 represents the baseline year for data collection. Long term targets will be established when baseline data are available.	Additional Source Information: Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: 2004 The data collection meets the requirements of Title II of the Higher Education Act, which created a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2005		80		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To reform teacher preparation programs in partnership with high need school districts and Schools of Arts and Sciences to produce highly qualified teachers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.</i>			Explanation: 999 designates the baseline year	Additional Source Information: The annual performance report is being revised to collect data based on the
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2003		999	<p>"Highly qualified" is defined in No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title IX, Sec. 9101. Certification is not necessarily simultaneous with program graduation; program completion is, therefore, defined as allowing for a reasonable period of time for graduates to pass the certification examinations.</p> <p>NCLB definition of "highly qualified" teacher.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: August 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: Data are self reported through annual performance reports.</p>
2004		75	
2005		80	
2006		85	
2007		88	
2008		90	

2005PM

IDEA Part C -- Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.181 - Special Education_Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers with disabilities and the capacity of families to meet the special needs of their child by assisting States in providing a comprehensive system of early intervention services.

Objective 8.1 of 2: The functional development of infants will be enhanced by early intervention services.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: **FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES:** By 2013, all infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C will exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of infants and toddlers demonstrating improved and sustained functional abilities</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be available in 2005. The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for this indicator. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: July 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		65		
2007		70		
2008		75		
2009		80		
2010		85		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: **FAMILY CAPACITY:** By 2013, all families served through Part C will report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of families reporting increased capacity</i>			Explanation: Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Survey/Research Report Title: IDEA Annual Part C Performance Report.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	72			

2001	73		Intervention Study (NEILS). The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for future data collections. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
2002		80		
2003		80		
2004		80		
2005		80		
2006		80		
2007		80		
2008		83		
2009		87		
2010		90		

Objective 8.2 of 2: All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The number if States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States serving at least 1 percent</i>				Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: IDEA Section 619 State-reported data. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Additional Source Information: IDEA section 618 State-reported data. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	21			
2002	23			
2003		25		
2004		26		
2005		27		
2006		28		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States serving at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers birth through age two</i>				Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: IDEA Section 618 State-reported data. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Additional Source Information: Part B, section 618 State-reported data. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	25			
2002	28			
2003		29		
2004		30		
2005		31		
2006		32		
Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: SERVICE SETTINGS: The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services promarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically-developing peers, will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically-developing peers.</i>				Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: IDEA section 618 State-reported data. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002	82	71		
2003		78		
2004		79		
2005		83		
2006		84		
2007		85		

2008		86		
2009		87		
2010		88		

2005PM

IDEA Part B Grants to States - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To help children with disabilities meet challenging standards and prepare them for postsecondary education, employment and independent living by assisting State and local educational agencies in providing them a free appropriate public education

Objective 8.1 of 3: All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and State assessments.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: PERFORMANCE AND INCLUSION IN NAEP: By 2013 all children with disabilities who participate in NAEP will meet or exceed basic levels in reading and math, and no more than 1% of children will be excluded from NAEP due to their disability.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP</i>			Explanation: For Math and Science the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For Reading the percentage includes only public school students.	Source: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress. Additional Source Information: Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: January 2004 Validated By: NCES. Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Limitations: Data on children with disabilities who meet or exceed basic standards and those who do not meet basic standards are based on very small sample sizes, and therefore, have a low level of reliability
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Reading	Reading		
2000	31			
2002		33		
2003		35		
2005		37		
2007		47		
<i>The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Mathematics Test</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Math	Math		
2000	26			
2003		28		
2005		32		

2007											42			
The percentage of 12th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Reading Test														
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets							
	Reading		Math				Reading		Math					
2000	35		28											
2002							39							
2003									30					
2005							43		34					
2007							53		44					
The percentage of children excluded from NAEP due to their disability														
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets							
	4th grade Reading	4th grade Math	8th grade Reading	8th grade Math	12th grade Reading	12th grade Math	4th grade Reading	4th grade Math	8th grade Reading	8th grade Math	12th grade Reading	12th grade Math		
2000	4	3	3											
2002	5	5												
2003	5	3	4	3										
2005							5	3	4	3				
2006							3	3	3	3				
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSEMENTS: By 2013, all children with disabilities will meet State proficiency standards as measured by Statewide assessments administered to meet NCLB requirements.														
Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality			
The percentage of children with disabilities that meets State proficiency standards as measured by Statewide assessments to meet NCLB requirements														
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets							
2005							999							
							Explanation: This is a new measure. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005 from IDEA Part B performance reports.				Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0624 Biennial Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.			

		Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
--	--	---

Objective 8.2 of 3: Secondary school students will complete high school prepared for postsecondary education, competitive employment, or independent living.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: GRADUATION AND DROPOUT: The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school with a regular high school diploma will increase, and the percentage that drops out will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
GRADUATION -- Percentage graduating with a regular diploma			Explanation: The method of calculation for this indicator has been revised to account for students who have moved but are not know to continue in special education. Instead of removing these students from the calculation, they are now considered to have dropped out. Prior year data have been adjusted for comparability.	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: Office of Special Education Programs. Survey/Research Report Title: IDEA Part B State-reported data. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	42			
1997	43			
1998	45			
1999	47			
2000	46			
2001	48			
2002	51			
2003		52		
2004		53		
2005		54		
2006		55		
2007		56		
2008		57		
2009		58		
2010		59		
DROP OUT -- Percentage that drops out from high school				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

1996	47			
1997	46			
1998	44			
1999	42			
2000	42			
2001	41			
2002	38	38		
2003		36		
2004		35		
2005		34		
2006		33		
2007		32		
2008		31		
2009		30		
2010		29		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL AND EMPLOYMENT: By 2013, the percentage of children with disabilities that is either (1) competitively employed; (2) enrolled in some type of postsecondary school; or (3) both, within two years of leaving high school will be at least that of their non-disabled peers.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children with disabilities that are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained from the the National Longitudinal Transition Study II in 2006.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: National Longitudinal Transition Study II Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Objective 8.3 of 3: All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 4: FULLY CERTIFIED TEACHERS UNDER IDEA: Increase in the nuymber of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>States in which 90 percent of special education teachers serving ages 6-21 are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching</i>			Explanation: There is a clustering of States around the 90 percent goal in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year. However, a positive trend is expected to be evident over a 7-8 year period.	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: Office of Special Educaiton Programs. Survey/Research Report Title: IDEA Part B State-reported data. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	35			
1997	36			
1998	37			
1999	34	41		
2000	36	42		
2001	37	42		
2002	33	42		
2003		37		
2004		37		
2005		39		
2006		40		
Indicator 8.3.2 of 4: HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS UNDER NCLB: By 2006, consistent with NCLB, all special education teachers who teach academic subjects will be highly qualified.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of special education teachers who teach academic subject areas, the percentage that is highly qualified.</i>				Source: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment: Common Core of Data. Additional Source Information: Consolidated State application. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: NCES.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		100		

Indicator 8.3.3 of 4: INCLUSIVE SETTINGS: Increase in the percentage of children with disabilities ages 6 through 21 served in the regular education classroom at east 80 percent of the day.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of childer ages 6-21 served in the regular classroom at least 80 percent of the day</i>					Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: Office of Special Education Programs. Survey/Research Report Title: IDEA Part B State-reported data. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
1997	46				
1998	46				
1999	47	48			
2000	47	48			
2001	47	49			
2002	48	49			
2003		48			
2004		48			
2005		50			
2006		52			
Indicator 8.3.4 of 4: GENERAL SUPERVISION: By 2007, every State will have a system of general supervision to assess whether its local educational agencies are ensuring that special education services are reasonably designed to result in the achievement of State standards by children with disabilities.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States with a system of general supervision that ensures that LEAs have reasonably designed services</i>			Explanation: This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.		Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0624 Biennial Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Additional Source Information: States will be evaluated using a General Supervision Critical Elements Tool starting in 2004. Frequency: Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
2005		999			
2007		56			

		Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
--	--	--

2005PM

IDEA Part D - Parent Information Centers - 2005

Goal 8: To provide training and information to parents of children with disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of the parent training and information projects

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS: By 2013, all PTI projects will use high quality materials

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all projects that use high quality materials</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be provided in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation.
2005		999		
<i>ADDRESSING LONG-TERM STRATEGIES. Percentage of projects addressing long-term strategies that use high quality materials</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
2005		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: HIGH QUALITY METHODS: By 2013, all PTI projects will use high quality methods.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of PTI projects that use high quality methods</i>				Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	26			
2004		33		
2005		40		
2006		47		
2007		54		
2008		62		
2009		69		
2010		78		

Strategy 8.1.1 of 12: Identify children with developmental delay in the first year of life.

Strategy 8.1.2 of 12: Identify children with learning and behavior difficulty prior to the third year of life.
Strategy 8.1.3 of 12: Serve children with disabilities ages birth through five in settings typical for non-disabled peers.
Strategy 8.1.4 of 12: Provide effective coordination of services for children with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.5 of 12: Identify knowledge and performance attributes of teachers and service providers that are related to improved outcomes for children with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.6 of 12: Improve reading skills of children with disabilities who are not progressing in the general education curriculum with effective interventions.
Strategy 8.1.7 of 12: Improve language/communication, cognitive functioning, and pre-reading skills of preschool children with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.8 of 12: Improve functional abilities and development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.9 of 12: Improve the development and use of universally designed educational standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment.
Strategy 8.1.10 of 12: Enhance school completion and prevent dropout.
Strategy 8.1.11 of 12: Improve transition and academic goals for adolescents with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.12 of 12: Enhance the capacity of States to improve results of children with disabilities.

Objective 8.2 of 2: PTI projects will provide parents with information they need to participate effectively in their child's education program.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: PARENTS SERVED: The number of parents trained or served by PTI projects will increase by 5 percent annually.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL AREAS. The number of parents who are trained or served.			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2004.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
ADDRESSING LONG-TERM STRATEGIES. The number of parents who are served in areas relating to long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.1).				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: RESULTS FROM TRAINING: By 2013, all parents receiving training or services from PTIs will report improved services for their child as a result of such training.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

ALL PARENTS. The percentage of all parents reporting improved services		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
ADDRESSING LONG-TERM STRATEGIES. The percentage of parents reporting improved services in areas relating to long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.1).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: ED Evaluation
Evaluation: Other.

Additional Source Information:
Independent annual evaluation

2005PM

IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are highly qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve children with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in effective, research-based practices.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: **CURRICULA:** By 2013, all training programs will have curricula that reflect the current knowledge base on effective practices and will produce trainees that are knowledgeable and skilled in these practices.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all projects that reflect current knowledge base on effective practices and produce trainees knowledgeable and skilled in these practices</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation.
2005		999		
<i>PROJECTS ADDRESSING LONG-TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long-term strategies (see below), the percentage that reflect current knowledge base on effective practices and produce trainees knowledgeable and skilled in thes practices</i>				Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Strategy 8.1.1 of 12: Identify children with developmental delay in the first year of life

Strategy 8.1.2 of 12: Identify children with learning and behavior difficulty prior to third grade.

Strategy 8.1.3 of 12: Serve children with disabilities ages birth through five in settings typical for non-disabled peers.

Strategy 8.1.4 of 12: Provide effective coordination of services for children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.5 of 12: Identify knowledge and performance attributes of teachers and service providers that are related to improved outcomes for children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.6 of 12: Improve reading skills of children with disabilities who are not progressing in the general education curriculum with effective interventions.

Strategy 8.1.7 of 12: Improve language/communication, cognitive functioning, and pre-reading skills of preschool children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.8 of 12: Improve functional abilities and development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.9 of 12: Improve development and use of universally-designed educational standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment.
Strategy 8.1.10 of 12: Enhance school completion and prevent dropout.
Strategy 8.1.11 of 12: Improve transition and academic goals for adolescents with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.12 of 12: Enhance the capacity of States to improve results of children with disabilities.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the extent to which the program trains personnel to serve in areas of high need.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: **AREAS OF HIGH NEED:** By 2013, all projects will train personnel to meet State-identified acute and chronic shortages (eg., child disability areas where states are experiencing acute or chronic shortages such as emotional disabilities; and other areas where the demand for qualified personnel exceed the supply, such as rural, inner city, and bilingual special education).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects that train personnel to meet State identified shortages</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be collected in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: **PROGRAM COMPLETERS:** By 2013, all scholars will complete their personnel preparation program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of scholars that complete their personnel preparation program.</i>				Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0530 Performance Report - Training Personnel for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	77			
2004		79		
2005		82		
2006		84		

<table><tr><td>2007</td><td></td><td>87</td></tr><tr><td>2008</td><td></td><td>89</td></tr><tr><td>2009</td><td></td><td>91</td></tr><tr><td>2010</td><td></td><td>94</td></tr></table>			2007		87	2008		89	2009		91	2010		94		Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
2007		87														
2008		89														
2009		91														
2010		94														
Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED: By 2013, 95 percent of the scholars will will be employed upon program completion in the critical need area for which they were trained.																
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
Percentage of scholars employed upon program completion in area trained				Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0530 Performance Report - Training Personnel for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2003	79															
2004		80														
2005		82														
2006		83														
2007		85														
2008		86														
2009		88														
2010		89														
Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT: By 2013, 80 percent of program completers will maintain employment for three or more years in the areas for which they were trained.																
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
Percent of program completers that maintain employment for at least three years in the areas for which they were trained.			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0530 Performance Report - Training Personnel for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2005		999														

		Agencies.
--	--	-----------

Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the extent to which the program supports scholars who are highly qualified for the position for which they are trained.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: PROGRAM COMPLETERS QUALIFIED UNDER NCLB: By 2013, all program completers teaching in core academic subjects will be highly qualified under NCLB requirements.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of program completers teaching in core academic subject, percentage that meet NCLB highly qualified requirements</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

2005PM

IDEA Part B Preschool Grants Program - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to learn by assisting States in providing special education and related services.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to enter school ready to learn.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: IMPROVED SKILLS: By 2013, all preschoolers with disabilities receiving special education and related services will improve their early language/communication, pre-reading, and social-emotional skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of preschool children with disabilities that demonstrate improved competency in these domains from the prior year.</i>			Explanation: This indicator focuses on these particular skills because they are the best indicators of success in later years. The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes center will provide baseline in 2008 using a subset of States that collect data.	Source: Other Other: National Evaluation. Sponsor: IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2007 - 2008 Data Available: July 2008
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2008		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: INCLUSIVE SETTING: All children with disabilities will receive education and related services in the least restrictive environment.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of preschool children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (e.g., preschool kindergarten, public preschool settings, and child care facilities)</i>				Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: IDEA State-reported data. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002	40	39		

2003		40		
2004		40		
2005		41		
2006		42		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: CERTIFIED TEACHERS: The number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States in which at least 90 percent of special education teachers serving children ages 3 through 5 are fully certified</i>				Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: IDEA State-reported data. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	34			
1997	35			
1998	37			
1999	34	40		
2000	36	41		
2001	35	40		
2002	34	40		
2003		36		
2004		36		
2005		37		
2006		38		

2005PM

IDEA Part D - State Improvement - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To assist State educational agencies in reforming and improving their systems for providing educational, early intervention and transitional services, including their systems of professional development, technical assistance and dissemination of knowledge about best practices, to improve results for children with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 3: State improvement grant projects will use research based knowledge to support systems change and professional development activities.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: **RESEARCH-BASED PROJECTS:** All SIG projects will use research-based knowledge to support systems change and professional development activities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects that use research-based knowledge</i>				Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Independent evaluation. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		100		

Objective 8.2 of 3: The SIG program will result in systems change consistent with state-identified needs.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: **SCALED-UP RESEARCH:** By 2010 the number of SIG projects that "scale-up" research-based State initiatives such as reading, behavior and other targeted areas through professional development and other activities will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of projects that scale-up research-based initiatives</i>			Explanation: This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Program performance reports. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

					Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: STATE DISSEMINATION SYSTEMS: By 2010, the number of States that enhance their State systems to disseminate research-based practices to teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, related services personnel, policy makers and other members of the educational community will increase.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States that enhance their State dissemination systems</i>			Explanation: This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.		Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: Program performance reports. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003. Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
2005		999			
Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: PERFORMANCE OF CHILDREN: By 2010, there will be an increase in the number of States with improved performance of children with disabilities based on SIG professional development activities in areas such as reading, behavior, math, dissemination of research-based practices, recruitment/retention of staff, and other State-identified needs.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>States with improved performance of children with disabilities based on SIG professional development activities</i>			Explanation: This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.		Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Survey/Research Report Title: Program performance report.. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 200 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
2005		999			

Objective 8.3 of 3: The State Improvement Grant Program will be implemented consistent with Congressional intent.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: CONGRESSIONAL INTENT: All SIG projects will be implemented consistent with Congressional intent.		
Targets and Performance Data		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of SIG projects that is implemented consistent with Congressional intent.</i>		Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Information will also be obtained from the SIG program performance report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	
2004		
2005		

2005PM

IDEA Part D - Technical Assistance & Dissemination - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To assist States and their partners in systems improvement through scientific-based practices.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of technical assistance and dissemination projects.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY METHODS: By 2013, all projects will use high quality methods.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all projects that use high quality methods			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: OSERS/OSEP. Survey/Research Report Title: Annual independent evaluation. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
ADDRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long term strategies, percentage that use high quality methods				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS: By 2013, all projects will produce high quality materials.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all projects that produce high quality materials</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained through an independent evaluation in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Additional Source Information: Independent evaluation
2005		999		
<i>ADRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long term strategies, percentage that produce high quality materials</i>				Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2005		999		Agencies.
Strategy 8.1.1 of 12: Identify children with developmental delay in the first year of life.				
Strategy 8.1.2 of 12: Identify children with learning and behavior difficulty prior to the third grade.				
Strategy 8.1.3 of 12: Serve children with disabilities ages birth through five in settings typical for non-disabled peers.				
Strategy 8.1.4 of 12: Provide effective coordination of services for children with disabilities.				
Strategy 8.1.5 of 12: Identify knowledge and performance attributes of teachers and services providers that are related to improved outcomes for children with disabilities.				
Strategy 8.1.6 of 12: Improve reading skills of children with disabilities who are not progressing in the general education curriculum with effective interventions.				
Strategy 8.1.7 of 12: Improve language/communication, cognitive functioning, and pre-reading skills of preschool children with disabilities.				
Strategy 8.1.8 of 12: Improve functional abilities and development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.				
Strategy 8.1.9 of 12: Improve the development and use of universally designed educational standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment.				
Strategy 8.1.10 of 12: Enhance school completion and prevent dropout.				
Strategy 8.1.11 of 12: Improve transition and academic goals for adolescents with disabilities.				
Strategy 8.1.12 of 12: Enhance the capacity of States to improve results for children with disabilities				

Objective 8.2 of 2: Products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: USEFUL PRODUCTS.: By 2013, all projects will provide useful products and services.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all projects providing useful products and services			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained through a third-party evaluation in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
ADDRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.1.2), percentage that provide useful products and services.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: IMPROVED TA CAPACITY: By 2013 all States and territories will report improved ability to provide technical assistance to their constituents as a				

result of training and information received from a TA&D project.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>OVERALL TA CAPACITY. Number of States that report improved ability to provide overall technical assistance</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005 through a third-party evaluation.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>ADRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Number of States that report improved ability to provide technical assistance relating to the program's long-term strategies</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>IDEA MONITORING INDICATORS. Number of States that report improved ability to provide overall technical assistance relating to IDEA monitoring indicators.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: IMPROVED RESULTS: By 2013, all States will demonstrate improved results for children with disabiliites.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Number of States that demonstrate improved results for children with disabilities relating to the program's long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.1.1).</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005 through an independent evaluation.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

2005PM

IDEA Part D - Technology & Media Services - 2005

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for children with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase the relevance of technology and media projects to the needs of children with disabilities.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: **RELEVANCE:** By 2013, all technology and media projects will be of high relevance to improving educational outcomes of children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL PROJECTS. The percentage of all projects that are of high relevance.			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2005.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
ADDRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long term program strategies, the percentage that are of high relevance.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Strategy 8.1.1 of 12: Identify children with developmental delay in the first year of life.

Strategy 8.1.2 of 12: Identify children with learning and behavior difficulty prior to the third grade.

Strategy 8.1.3 of 12: Serve children with disabilities ages birth through five in settings typical for non-disabled peers.

Strategy 8.1.4 of 12: Provide effective coordination of services for children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.5 of 12: Identify knowledge and performance attributes of teachers and service providers that are related to improved outcomes for children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.6 of 12: Improve reading skills of children with disabilities who are not progressing in the general education curriculum with effective interventions.

Strategy 8.1.7 of 12: Improve language/communication, cognitive functioning, and pre-reading skills of preschool children with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.8 of 12: Improve functional abilities and development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Strategy 8.1.9 of 12: Improve the development and use of universally designed educational standards, curriculum, instruction and assessments.

Strategy 8.1.10 of 12: Enhance school completion and prevent dropout.
Strategy 8.1.11 of 12: Improve transition and academic goals for adolescents with disabilities.
Strategy 8.1.12 of 12: Enhance the capacity of States to improve the results of children with disabilities.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of media and technology projects.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY: By 2013, all technology and media projects will be of high quality.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS--TECHNOLOGY. Of all technology projects, the percentage that are of high quality.</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be collected in 2005	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>ADDRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES--TECHNOLOGY. Of all technology projects addressing long term strategies (listed under indicator 8.1.1), the percentage that are of high quality.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>ALL PROJECTS--MEDIA. The percentage of media projects that are of high quality.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS. The percentage of all projects that produce products, fundings and/or services that contribute to improving results for children with disabilities.</i>				Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

<p><i>ADDRESSING LONG TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects that address long term program strategies (listed under indicator 8.1.1), the percentage that produce products, findings, and/or services that contribute to improving results for children with disabilities.</i></p>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		

2005PM

McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program - 2005

CFDA Number:

84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

Goal 8: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Public schools: Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin, as reported by LEA subgrantees will increase.</i>			Explanation: This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003-4 and represents a new statutory requirement Section 722(g)(3)(A). 2005 data will be obtained from States with districts that received subgrant funds. The McKinney-Vento Act 2005 target is baseline + 5%	Additional Source Information: The data to be collected from States are from LEAs that have received subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: November 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: This data is not a statutory requirement and no statutory required data on program improvement is required from States and available until 2006. Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the LEA level and reported only for schools that receive McKinney-Vento subgrants.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of homeless children and youth included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees</i>	Explanation: Baseline data was from one time	Additional Source Information: The data to be collected from States are from LEAs that have received

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td><td>20</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>28</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	20		2004		24	2005		28	<p>collection from 2002. FY 2003 data not available.</p>	<p>subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: November 2004 Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p> <p>Limitations: This data is not a statutory requirement and no statutory required data on program improvement is required from States and available until 2006.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2002	20													
2004		24												
2005		28												
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.														
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>												
<p><i>Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td><td>53</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>58</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>64</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	53		2004		58	2005		64	<p>Explanation: Baseline will be established in 2002; there was no required data collection for 2003.</p>	<p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: November 2004 Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p> <p>Limitations: There is no statutory requirement for annual data collections to determine year to year progress.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2002	53													
2004		58												
2005		64												

2005PM

Special Institutions for Persons with Disabilities American Printing House for the Blind (APH) - 2005

Goal 8: Pre-college-level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials which result in improved educational outcomes

Objective 8.1 of 1: APPROPRIATE, TIMELY, HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED TO PRE-COLLEGE-LEVEL BLIND STUDENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO BENEFIT MORE FULLY FROM THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Customer satisfaction:: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the Act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Trustees-Percentage that agree</i>			Status: Target exceeded Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the American Printing House's Ex Officio Trustees, Advisory Committees, Consumers, and Teachers highly agree that the educational materials provided through the Act that authorizes the American Printing House are appropriate, timely, and of high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs. Explanation: The American Printing House worked with an independent Research Corporation this past summer (2003) in an effort to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its Trustees, Advisory Committees, Consumers and Teachers.	Additional Source Information: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; Consumer surveys, and Teacher surveys. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	95			
1999	96	95		
2000	96.50	96		
2001	97	96		
2002	99	96		
2003	98.75	96		
2004		96		
2005		98		
<i>Advisory Committees-Percentage that agree</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	100	100		
2000	100	100		
2001	100	100		
2002	100	100		
2003	100	100		

2004		100		
2005		100		
Consumers-Percentage that agree				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	90			
2000	100	95		
2001	97	95		
2002	96	95		
2003	100	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		
Teachers - Percentage that agree				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	96			
2003	97	96		
2004		96		
2005		96		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act will be maintained.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Trustees-Percentage that agree			Status: Target met Progress: In fiscal year 2003, a high percentage of the Ex Officio Trustees and Teachers agreed that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improved as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act. Explanation: The American Printing House	Additional Source Information: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers (2003). Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	98			
1999	98	98		
2000	97	99		
2001	97	99		

2002	100	99	worked with an independent Research Corporation this past summer (2003) in an effort to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its Trustees and from Teachers.	verification procedure applied.
2003	99.50	99		
2004		99		
2005		99		
Teachers--Percentage that agree				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	93			
2003	95	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

2005PM

Goal 3

Character Education - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215S - Partnerships in Character Education Program

Goal 8: To help promote the development of strong character among the Nation's students

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Partnership in Character Education Program grantees will demonstrate predicted student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality				
<i>The proportion of projects demonstrating predicted student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations</i>					Explanation: Grantees propose projects that include evaluations that entail experimental or quasi-experimental design. Evaluation reports will not be available annually. Although grantees are required to submit annual performance reports, evaluation results are required to be included in those reports after year two and year four of the four-year grants. No target is established for years in which evaluation reports are not due. Because this program was new in FY 2002 and no cohorts have completed implementation, targets estimate the success that we believe grantees will have. Targets may need to be revised as implementation progresses.				Additional Source Information: Review of biennial evaluation reports included in program files. Because of different grant cohorts, information will be available each year for one or more cohorts, but data related to each cohort is collected biennially. Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: Evaluation results will be available after two years and at the completion of the each project.				
Year	Actual Performance									Performance Targets			
	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort						2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2004										25			
2005										25			
2006										75		25	
2007										75		25	
2008												75	
2009							75						

2005PM

Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215F - Carol M. White Physical Education Program

Goal 8: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of effective physical education program and strategies.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Meeting State physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate that program activities are helping grantees meet State standards for physical education

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of grantees whose students have made progress toward achieving State standards in physical education.</i>				Explanation: Targets reflect different cohorts.		Additional Source Information: Performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort					2005 Cohort
2005			50					
2006			75					50
2007			90					75
2008								90
<i>The percentage of grantees that increase the number of physical education teachers/staff trained to instruct students in physical education activities consistent with State standards.</i>								
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort					2005 Cohort
2005			50					
2006			75					50
2007			90					75
2008								90

2005PM

Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Programs - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.184 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities_National Programs
 84.184B - ESEA Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program
 84.184L - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program

Goal 8: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention strategies.

Objective 8.1 of 3: With the Departments of Health and Human Services and Justice, support grants to local educational agencies to implement comprehensive strategies to reduce youth drug use and violence and encourage healthy youth development.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Decreased number of violent incidents: [Empty]			
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress
<i>Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites will experience a decrease in the number of violent incidences at school over the 3-year grant period.</i>			Explanation: Targets for this indicator will be developed following collection of baseline data in 2005.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	
			Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Decreased student substance abuse: [Empty]			
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress
<i>Targeted students in Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites will experience a decrease in substance use over the 3-year grant period.</i>			Explanation: Targets for this indicator will be developed following collection of baseline data in 2005.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	
			Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Improved student attendance: [Empty]			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student attendance in Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites will improve.</i>		Explanation: Targets for this indicator will be developed following collection of baseline data in 2005.	Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance		
2005		Performance Targets	
		999	

Objective 8.2 of 3: Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Sustained mentoring matches: [Empty]			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of student/mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months will increase.</i>		Explanation: No target is established for this measure in 2005 because grant sites will need to have operated for a minimum of twelve months in order to produce any student/mentor matches that meet the criteria established for this measure.	Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance		
	[Empty]	Performance Targets	
2006		Percentage of grantees	
2007		25	
		50	

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Improved academic achievement: [Empty]			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees in which at least 25 percent of mentored students demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects after 6 months will increase.</i>			Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance		
	[Empty]	Performance Targets	
2005		Percentage of grantees	
2006		5	
		30	

2007		60		
Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Reduced disciplinary referrals: [Empty]				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of grantees whose mentored students are referred for disciplinary reasons will decrease.</i>				Additional Source Information: Annual Grantee Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	[Empty]	Percentage of grantees		
2005		10		
2006		40		
2007		60		

2005PM

Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants Program - 2005

Goal 8: Develop Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-free Learning Environments

Objective 8.1 of 1: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 6: Illegal drugs at school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the 12 months prior to the survey.</i>				Additional Source Information: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies. Limitations: Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
		Percentage of students		
2005		27		
2007		25		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Students using marijuana on school property: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 that used marijuana on school property

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students who used marijuana on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.</i>				Additional Source Information: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control. Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies. Data are collected every other year
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		5		
2007		4		

		from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.									
Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Students drinking alcohol on school property: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 that had at least one drink of alcohol on school property											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of students who had at least one drink of alcohol on school property on one or more of the past 30 days.</i></p> <table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>2007</td><td></td><td>4</td></tr> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		4	2007		4		<p>Additional Source Information: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.</p> <p>Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies. Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2005		4									
2007		4									
Indicator 8.1.4 of 6: Students who don't feel safe at school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who missed school at least one time because they felt unsafe at school											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of students who did not go to school on one or more of the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school.</i></p> <table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>2007</td><td></td><td>5</td></tr> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		6	2007		5		<p>Additional Source Information: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.</p> <p>Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p>Limitations: Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2005		6									
2007		5									

Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Students carrying weapons to school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 that carried a weapon on school property			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more of the past 30 days.</i>			Additional Source Information: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control Frequency: Biennially. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: September 2006 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies. Limitations: Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.
Year	Actual Performance		
2005			
2007			
Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Use of scientifically-based programs: The proportion of local grantees that are using program funds to implement programs based on scientific research			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of grantees that are using programs funds to support programs based on scientific research</i>			Additional Source Information: Department will issue contract for an Evaluation Study Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: July 2005
Year	Actual Performance		
2005			

2005PM

Goal 4

Research, Development and Dissemination - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

Goal 8: Transform education into an evidence-based field.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: The percentage of newly-funded research proposals funded by IES that receive an average panel review score of excellent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of newly-funded research proposals funded by IES that receive an average panel review score of excellent.</i>				Additional Source Information: The average panel review score for each newly funded IES research proposal will be calculated. Data will be collected annually. The 2003 target of 70% represents baseline data. 2004 indicator will be $(BL + 100)/2$ (i.e., halfway to goal). Frequency: Annually. Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of only senior scientists leading researchers in their fields assures the quality of the data.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		70		
2004		85		
2005		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i>			Progress: No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003.	Additional Source Information: IES selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications from IES. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review. Data will be collected annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	100	50		
2003	0	70		

<table><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>95</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>95</td></tr></table>	2004		95	2005		95		<p>Frequency: Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>												
2004		95																		
2005		95																		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.																				
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<i>Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.</i>																				
<table><tr><td>Year</td><td>Actual Performance</td><td>Performance Targets</td></tr><tr><td>2001</td><td>32</td><td>32</td></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td>100</td><td>75</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td>97</td><td>75</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>75</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>75</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	32	32	2002	100	75	2003	97	75	2004		75	2005		75		<p>Additional Source Information: IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target for 2002-2005 recognizes that some high quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the 2 IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																		
2001	32	32																		
2002	100	75																		
2003	97	75																		
2004		75																		
2005		75																		

		causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.		
Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.		Progress: No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003.	Additional Source Information: IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target recognizes that some high quality studies will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs. Frequency: Annually.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2002	100			75
2003	0			75
2004				75
2005				75

		<p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the 2 IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.</p>
--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

<i>The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i>			Progress: 2003 data not yet available (Oct 2003).	Additional Source Information: External panel of qualified practitioners will evaluate the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals. Data will be collected annually. The final target of 75% recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant, but will make important contributions over the long-term. Frequency: Annually. Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	25	25		
2003		37		
2004		50		
2005		62		
2006		75		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting education products and approaches.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting education products and approaches.</i>				Additional Source Information: Survey of education decision-makers and policymakers. Data will be collected every 3 years. Frequency: Other. Data are valid to the extent that sample includes education decision-makers across high-, low-, and average-achieving districts and states across urban and rural areas, and from all regions of the country. The sample included district superintendents, chief state school officers, and state higher education executive officers across all of these dimensions.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	42	42		
2005		66		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.</i>					Additional Source Information: What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for number of annual hits is FY 2003. Web-based program will automatically count hits on web site.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000			
2004		2,000,000			
2005		2,500,000			
Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: The percentage of WWC website users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC website is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of WWC website users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC website is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."</i>					Additional Source Information: What Works Clearinghouse (Indicator 8.2.4). Data collected in 2004 will be the baseline data. Subsequent targets will be adjusted after we have the baseline data. No available data in 2003.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
2004		30			
2005		50			

2005PM

IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation - 2005

Goal 8: To produce and advance the use of knowledge to improve services provided under IDEA and results for children with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the quality of research and development projects

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY PROJECTS: By 2013, all research and development projects will be deemed to be of high quality

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
RESEARCH -- Percentage of high quality projects				Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: OSERS/OSEP. Survey/Research Report Title: Independent Annual Evaluation of IDEA Part D. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	73			
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		82		
2006		84		
2007		86		
2008		88		
2009		90		
2010		92		
MODELS -- Percentage of high quality projects				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	57			
2003		70		
2004		75		
2005		72		
2006		73		
2007		74		
2008		77		

2009		80		
2010		83		
OUTREACH -- Percentage of high quality projects				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	40			
2003		55		
2004		65		
2005		57		
2006		58		
2007		61		
2008		64		
2009		68		
2010		71		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: RANDOMIZED DESIGNS: By 2013, all projects that address causal questions will employ randomized experimental designs				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of employ randomized experimental designs				**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** Department/IES review of funded research projects **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	50			
2003		65		
2004		69		
2005		73		
2006		76		
2007		79		
2008		83		
2009		86		
2010		90		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the relevance of research and development projects to the needs of children with disabilities

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: RELEVANCE JUDGED BY SCIENTISTS: By 2013, scientists will judge all research and development projects to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS -- percent of all R&D projects judged by scientists to be of high relevance</i>			Progress: This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005. The target for 2013 is 100 percent of projects deemed to be of high relevance by scientists.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent evaluation of funded projects Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 200 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>LONG-TERM STRATEGIES -- Of projects that address the long-term program strategies, the percent judged by scientists to be of high relevance</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: RELEVANCE JUDGED BY STAKEHOLDERS: By 2013, stakeholders will judge all research and development projects to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS -- percent of all R&D projects judged by stakeholders to be of high relevance</i>			Progress: Targets for this indicator will be set in 2004 after baseline data are obtained. The target for 2013 is 100 percent of projects deemed to be of high relevance by stakeholders.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent evaluation of program Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: September 2005 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
<i>LONG-TERM STRATEGIES -- Of projects that address the long-term program strategies the percent judged by stakeholders to be of high relevance.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Strategy 8.2.1 of 12: Identify children with developmental delay in the first year of life.				
Strategy 8.2.2 of 12: Identify children with learning and behavior difficulty prior to the third grade.				
Strategy 8.2.3 of 12: Serve children with disabilities ages birth through five in settings typical for non-disabled peers.				
Strategy 8.2.4 of 12: Provide effective coordination of services for children with disabilities.				

Strategy 8.2.5 of 12: Identify knowledge and performance attributes of teachers and service providers that are related to improved outcomes for children with disabilities.
Strategy 8.2.6 of 12: Improve reading skills of children with disabilities who are not progressing in the general education curriculum with effective interventions.
Strategy 8.2.7 of 12: Improve language/communication, cognitive functioning, and pre-reading skills of preschool children with disabilities.
Strategy 8.2.8 of 12: Improve functional abilities and development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.
Strategy 8.2.9 of 12: Improve the development and use of universally designed standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment.
Strategy 8.2.10 of 12: Enhance school completion and prevent dropout.
Strategy 8.2.11 of 12: Improve transition and academic goals for adolescents with disabilities.
Strategy 8.2.12 of 12: Enhance the capacity of States to improve the results of children with disabilities.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Produce high quality products and communicate information for appropriate audiences.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTS: By 2013, the percentage of projects that produce high quality products appropriate for the target audience will increase to 95 percent (all projects) and 85 percent (projects addressing long-term strategies).				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>AL PROJECTS. Percent of all R&D projects that produce high quality products for atarget audience.</i>			Explanation: By 2013, 95 percent of all projects, and 85 percent of projects addressing long-term strategies, will produce high quality products appropriate for target audience.	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Additional Source Information: Independent annual evaluation of program Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
<i>PROJECTS ADDRESSING STRATEGIES. Of R&D projects addressing long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.2.2), percent that produce high quality products appropriate for target audience</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: PUBLISHED FINDINGS: By 2013, the percentage of research projects that have findings published in peer-refereed journals will increase to 90 percent (all projects) and 85 percent (projects addressing long-term strategies).				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ALL PROJECTS. Percentage of all research projects that have fundings published in peer refereed journals.</i>			Explanation: Baseline data will be obtained in 2004	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Other. Frequency: Annually
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2005		999	Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: August 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
<i>PROJECTS ADDRESSING LONG-TERM STRATEGIES. Of projects addressing long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.2.2), the percentage that have findings published in perr refereed journals.</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	

2005PM

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.133 - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

Goal 8: To conduct high-quality research that leads to high quality research products

Objective 8.1 of 3: Conduct high-quality research

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Activity-Oriented Measure of Research Quality: The percentage of grantee research and development activity that is deemed to be “good to excellent” as reflected in the appropriateness of the designs, the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research and development activity builds on and contributes to the level of knowledge in the field.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantee research and development activity rated 4 or greater in appropriateness of study designs, the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research and development activity builds on and contributes to the level of knowledge in the field, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale.</i>			Status: Target not met Progress: For FY 2005 the performance measure has been revised to clarify the standards of excellence in research and development upon which expert judgments will be based and to make it more consistent with the Department of Education's increased emphasis on scientific research. Eliminated from the previous measure were two standards pertaining to the "expertise of the investigators" and the degree to which the "center conducts a coordinated program of R&D exhibiting synergy" of theory, objectives and methods across projects. The first was eliminated because it was determined to be more a reflection of quality of research management than research conduct, and the second was eliminated to make the performance measure applicable to the future inclusion of a broader range of NIDRR R&D funding mechanisms other than "centers." Data from 2002 and 2003 were re-analyzed to be consistent with the new measure, revealing a pattern of significant improvement in the percentage of centers meeting the enhanced standard.	Source: Other Other: Expert Panel. Sponsor: NIDRR. Date Sponsored: 11/30/2003. Additional Source Information: Qualitative data from summative program review meetings with expert panels. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Observer Report completed by an outside expert in disability and rehabilitation science as part of an independent evaluation of the FY 2003 series of NIDRR Summative Program Reviews. Limitations: The data for this indicator are limited to the two largest program mechanisms within the NIDRR portfolio -- i.e., RERCs and RRTCs. Within these programs, the
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	54	65		
2003	67	70		
2004		70		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

	<p>Explanation: 2002 and 2003 data are based on ratings from the FY02 and FY03 series of summative program reviews conducted with 28 (9 RERCs and 19 RRTC's) and 9 (3 RERCs & 6 RRTC's) centers, respectively. Ratings were performed by expert panels selected from key stakeholder groups, including researchers and scientists, practitioners and providers, policy analysts, industry representatives, and individuals with disabilities. Specific elements of performance rated come from NIDRR's "centers of excellence" (CoE) model and include: use of appropriate and rigorous scientific designs and methods that extend the state-of-the-art, appropriateness of research tools, adequacy of sample size and diversity, and potential contribution to advancement of knowledge and/or product development. The percentage of centers meeting the new standard is significantly lower for 2002 (54%) than for 2003 (67%), which reflects increased technical assistance provided to grantees between their formative and summative reviews. Actual performance falls below established targets primarily because the original measure was less rigorous and included a standard for "expertise" on which almost all centers scored high.</p>	<p>data are further limited to the subset of centers that were scheduled for summative program review in 2002 & 2003, based on the year of their initial award. This strategy of basing GPRA performance data on the centers that happen to be due for summative review in a given year contributes to considerable year-to-year variations in the both number and type of centers reviewed as well as in the composition of the review panels.</p> <p>Improvements: To improve the measurement of this indicator in FY 2004 NIDRR is planning to: (1) augment the data source to include information from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system, (2) expand the sample of centers and projects assessed for "quality of research," and (3) refine the "centers of excellence" (CoE) criteria upon which the ratings of research quality are based. These improvements are scheduled to go into effect in FY 2005 based upon a redesign of the APPR and psychometric analysis of the CoE criteria.</p>									
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Outputs-Oriented Measure of Research Quality: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.											
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>									
<p><i>The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td><td></td><td>999</td></tr> <tr> <td>2003</td><td></td><td>5</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002		999	2003		5
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2002		999									
2003		5									
	<p>Explanation: Performance targets for this revised indicator have been converted to Baseline to allow NIDRR to address significant problems detected in the bibliographic data contained in the annual web-based project performance reporting (APPR) system that</p>	<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects). Program: NIDRR</p>									

2004		5	<p>prevent reliable calculation of the measure. Additional baseline analyses will examine the merits of creating sub-measures of the indicator that reflect variations in expectations for peer-reviewed publications based on differences in the size of awards and the subfield of rehabilitation research generating the publication (i.e., medical rehabilitation vs. rehab engineering). The performance target for 2003 will be Baseline + 5%.</p>	<p>Contractor: Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the web-based project performance reporting systems to verify grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed publications.</p> <p>Limitations: The existing data collection mechanism for this indicator provides insufficient structure and documentation to eliminate duplication of records and accurately identify bibliographic data by year and type of publication. Given these limitations, it is necessary to re-analyze the data from 2002 to establish a reliable Baseline measure. Data on peer-reviewed publications are also limited to the self-reports of grantees from only five NIDRR program mechanisms (i.e., RRTCs, RERCs, model systems, DRRPs, and ARRTs). Another potential limitation involves reliance on a single aggregate measure of scientific productivity regardless of amount of award or nature of research. Refereed journal articles may be a better indicator of scientific productivity for awards in medical rehabilitation research than they are for other areas of NIDRR's portfolio related to community integration and product development. Similarly, projects funded at \$150,000 per year should not be expected to publish at the same rate as centers funded at \$800,000/year.</p>
2005		5		

		<p>Improvements: NIDRR is currently working with the contractor to develop strategies to improve the documentation and reporting functions of the APPR system. Additional improvements involve expanding data collection to include peer-reviewed publications from other program mechanisms (i.e., Field Initiated projects, fellowships, and Disability and Business Technical Assistance Centers), working with other ED staff to conduct an audit of grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed publications, and developing strategies to assess productivity that fairly represent all parts of the NIDRR grant portfolio.</p>												
<p>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Outcomes-Oriented Measure of Research Quality: The number of new or improved tools, instruments, protocols, technologies and programs developed, evaluated, and published by grantees that are deemed to improve the measurement of disability and rehabilitation-related concepts and/or contribute to changes/improvements in policy, practice, or outcomes for individuals with disabilities and their families.</p>														
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p><i>Number of new or improved tools, instruments, protocols, technologies and programs developed, evaluated, and published by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in terms of improving the measurement of disability and rehabilitation-related concepts and/or contributing to changes/improvements in policy, practice, or outcomes for individuals with disabilities and their families.</i></p> </td></tr> <tr> <td>Year</td><td>Actual Performance</td><td>Performance Targets</td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>999</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>5</td></tr> </table>			<p><i>Number of new or improved tools, instruments, protocols, technologies and programs developed, evaluated, and published by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in terms of improving the measurement of disability and rehabilitation-related concepts and/or contributing to changes/improvements in policy, practice, or outcomes for individuals with disabilities and their families.</i></p>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		5
<p><i>Number of new or improved tools, instruments, protocols, technologies and programs developed, evaluated, and published by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in terms of improving the measurement of disability and rehabilitation-related concepts and/or contributing to changes/improvements in policy, practice, or outcomes for individuals with disabilities and their families.</i></p>														
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2004		999												
2005		5												
<p>Progress: Preliminary analyses are currently underway by the contractor -- National Rehabilitation Information Center (NARIC) -- responsible for collecting products from NIDRR grantees.</p> <p>Explanation: In 2004 NIDRR will set a baseline for this indicator based on analysis of data from the annual web-based project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels. The FY 2005 Target will be the baseline + 5%.</p>		<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects). Program: NIDRR. Contractor: Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p>Additional Source Information: Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004</p>												

		<p>Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panels</p> <p>Improvements: To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face to face program-review-type meetings.</p>
--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure utility of consumer-oriented products and services to end-users based on NIDRR-funded research and related activities

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Outcomes-Oriented Measure of Utility of Products & Services: The percentage of consumer-oriented dissemination products and services, nominated by grantees to be their "best" outputs based on NIDRR-funded research and related activities, that are deemed to be of high-utility and contributing to advances in knowledge and/or to changes/improvements in policy, practice, services, and/or supports by individuals with disabilities and other end-users, including practitioners, service providers, and policy makers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of consumer-oriented dissemination products and services, nominated by grantees to be their best outputs based on NIDRR-funded research and related activities, that are rated "good to excellent" in utility and in contributions to advances in knowledge and/or to changes/improvements in policy, practice, services, and/or supports by individuals with disabilities and other end-users, including practitioners, service providers, and policy makers.</i>			Explanation: A baseline will be set in FY 2004 based on analyses of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgements of expert panels. The FY 2005 target will be 5 percent over the baseline. Out year targets will increase by five percentage points up to 80 percent.	Source: Other Other: Expert Panel. Sponsor: NIDRR. Date Sponsored: 09/30/2004.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Additional Source Information: Qualitative ratings of the utility of consumer-oriented products and services by expert panels of individuals with disabilities and other end-users.
2004		999		
2005		5		
				Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review of expert panels made up of representatives from key stakeholder groups.

		Improvements: To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face to face program-review-type meetings.
--	--	--

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase access to assistive and universally designed technologies to improve rehabilitation outcomes and enhance opportunities for full participation in community and family life

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Outcomes-Oriented Measure of Results of R&D Investment: The number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are deemed to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in ability to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or to enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.</i>			Explanation: A baseline will be set in FY 2004 based on analysis of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels. For FY 2005 the target will be 5 percent over the baseline.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects). Program: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research. Additional Source Information: Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panel Improvements: To reduce the costs
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		

		and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face to face program-review-type meetings.
--	--	---

2005PM

Goal 5

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education_State Grant Program

Goal 8: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education Programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.</i>			Explanation: Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicators, new performance target/baseline has been established. 2001 is the baseline year. Data reflect percent of Adult Education Learners (Adults With Limited Basic Skills) who demonstrated a level of basic skill proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning literacy through high school. Revised indicators require validation of basic skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults		
1997	40			
1998	31			
1999	44			
2000	26	40		
2001	36	40		
2002	37	40		
2003		41		
2004		42		
2005		42		

					Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English Literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled. 2001 is the new baseline.</i>			Explanation: Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicator, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect percent of English Literacy learners (adults with minimal English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning-level English Literacy through advanced-level English Literacy. Revised indicators requires validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.		Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1996	30				Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.
1997	28				
1998	28				
1999	49				
2000	20	40			
2001	31	40			
2002	34	42			
2003		44			
2004		45			
2005		45			
			Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review		

		process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.																																				
Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.																																						
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress																																				
<p><i>Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.</i></p> <table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Percent of adults</td><td>Percent of adults</td></tr> <tr> <td>1996</td><td>36</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>1997</td><td>37</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>1998</td><td>33</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>1999</td><td>34</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2000</td><td>34</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr> <td>2001</td><td>33</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr> <td>2002</td><td>42</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr> <td>2003</td><td></td><td>41</td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>42</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>45</td></tr> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percent of adults	Percent of adults	1996	36		1997	37		1998	33		1999	34		2000	34	40	2001	33	40	2002	42	40	2003		41	2004		42	2005		45	<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p>Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting.</p> <p>Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																				
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults																																				
1996	36																																					
1997	37																																					
1998	33																																					
1999	34																																					
2000	34	40																																				
2001	33	40																																				
2002	42	40																																				
2003		41																																				
2004		42																																				
2005		45																																				

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Transition to post-secondary education or training: Percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.								
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
Percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.					<p>Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator new performance benchmarks/targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The new performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal of further education or training, who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program.</p>		<p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p>Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p>Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults				
1996	175,255							
1997	178,520							
1998	158,167							
1999	148,803							
2000	161,650		300,000					
2001		25						
2002		30		25				
2003				26				
2004				27				
2005				30				

Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.</i>					Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The 2001 performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal, who, upon exit from an adult education program obtain a job.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults		Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.
1996	306,982					Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1997	340,206					
1998	294,755					
1999	409,062					
2000	454,318		425,000			
2001		36				
2002		39		36		
2003				37		
2004				38		
2005				40		

2005PM

National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) - 2005

Goal 8: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) (new-2002) - 2002

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The National Reporting System (NRS), that supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high quality learner assessment data.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of States yielding high quality learner assessment data.</i>			<p>Progress: Approximately 50% of states currently have assessment policies that yield quality data.</p> <p>Explanation: Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high quality assessment data.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: State Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2005 Data Available: March 2006 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks, expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.</p> <p>Limitations: Total data quality and full systems development is dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE; and supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	50			
2003		75		
2004		95		
2005		96		

2005PM

National Institute for Literacy - 2005

Goal 8: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan

Objective 8.1 of 2: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Research to Practice: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of recipients who say they will use the product and/or information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within six months.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: These measures are all new. NIFL expects to use FY2004 data as a baseline	Source 1: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Aspen Systems/EDPubs. Date Sponsored: 12/11/2003. Source 2: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: The National Institute for Literacy. Date Sponsored: 12/11/2003. Source 3: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: National Institute for Literacy. Survey/Research Report Title: Training/Technical Assistance Evaluations. Additional Source Information: Re: Source #2: The National Institute for Literacy will create a "dialogue" box on the NIFL website that asks visitors if they are willing to answer a few questions. If so, they will be asked whether they plan to use the online publications to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within the next six months. Frequency: Other.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	[Empty]	%		
2004		999		
2005		40		

		Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: December 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: Not everyone who reads or downloads NIFL publications will agree to respond to the questions.
--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 2: Disseminate high quality information and resources on literacy.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: Disseminate high quality information and resources on literacy.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of visitors to NIFL website</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: Baseline is the 2005 data collection. Targets for 2005 are 1.5 million web hits and more than 35 percent of users who use literacy resources for more than 5 minutes.	Source 1: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: The National Institute for Literacy. Date Sponsored: 12/11/2003. Source 2: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: The National Institute for Literacy. Date Sponsored: 12/11/2003. Additional Source Information: NIFL will use software that tracks the length of time visitors stay on the "special collections" of high quality literacy resources. Frequency: Monthly. Collection Period: 2005 - 2006 Data Available: November 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		1.50		
<i>Percentage of visitors to any of the "special collections" of high quality literacy resources who stay 5 minutes or more.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		35		

Assistive Technology Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

Goal 8: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Facilitate the change of laws and policies to obtain increased availability or provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Outcomes-oriented measure: the percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes which are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes which are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services</i>			<p>Progress: The percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes which are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services decreased from 78% in FY 01 to 63% in FY02.</p> <p>Explanation: Grantees who receive funding under Title I of the AT Act of 1998 submit information, in a web-based data collection system, about the legislative and policy changes that they achieved in the five areas outlined in Section 101(e)(1)(A) of the AT Act of 1998. The five areas include community living, education, employment, health care, and telecommunications and IT. The decrease in the percentage of grantees reporting legislative and/or policy changes may reflect a reduced need for these changes. NIDRR will work with a technical assistance grantee to identify factors that are associated with a decrease in the performance for this indicator. NIDRR will use the results of the data analysis to reassess the need</p>	<p>Source: Other Other: Other. Sponsor: Web-based grantee information. Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004</p> <p>Limitations: The data for FY 01 is based on information submitted by only 51 of the 56 grantees and the data for FY 02 is based on information submitted by all 56 grantees.</p> <p>Improvements: It should be easier to compare the data for FY 02 and FY 03 since use of the web-based reporting system by grantees became mandatory in FY02. NIDRR is working with a technical assistance grantee to revise the web-based data collection system for the Title I state grantees to translate the statutory requirements</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2001	78	95		
2002	63	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

					to continue using this indicator. If a determination is made to continue using the indicator, NIDRR may establish a different performance target based on an analysis of the actual performance from 1997 through 2003.	under the AT Act into measurable performance indicators that reflect the Department's focus on accountability and outcomes-oriented measures. Proposed changes to the data collection tool were announced in the Federal Register on November 24, 2003.
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Outcome-oriented measure of loans: The number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds.						
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million Federal investment and State matching funds</i>					<p>Progress: The Title III Alternative Financing Program was funded for the first time in FY 2000 to increase access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities. Of the \$7.6 million of government funds available in the first year, grantees made 247 loans to individuals with disabilities for a rate of 33 loans per \$1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds. The total amount loaned out was \$2.3 million. Of the \$18.2 million of new government funds available in FY 2001, grantees made 594 loans to individuals with disabilities for a rate of 33 loans per \$1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds. The total amount loaned in the second year was \$5.8 million.</p> <p>Explanation: Comparing the data from FY 2000 and FY 2001 is difficult because this is a fairly new program and the number of years of participation differs among grantees. In FY 2000 6 states were funded. In FY 2001, 10 new states received grants and 4 states were refunded from year one for a total of 14 awards. Actual performance for FY 2001 also included loans made by two states that only received one award in FY 2000 but made loans over both years. Since there were no new awards in FY 2002, it will be easier to compare data from FY 2001 and</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Annual web-based reporting system.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004</p> <p>Limitations: The data on the # of loans approved and closed during the performance period of October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001 differ between the first annual report (229 loans) and the second annual report (247). This discrepancy suggests that grantees submitted additional data after the first annual report was published. The data collection tool for the AFP needs to be evaluated and then modified to improve the reliability of the data used to calculate the total number of loans reported for the AFP for a given performance period. At the present time, there are two reporting systems for the AFP. At the end of the AFP grant year, grantees submit loan program data in a Web-based program data collection system using the Annual Loan Program Data Form. Grantees also submit loan program data on a regular basis in a Web-</p>
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	Fed dollars in Millions	State dollars in Millions	# of loans	# of loans per 1million dollars invested	# of loans per 1million dollars invested	
2000	3.80	3.80	247	33		
2001	13.60	4.60	594	33		
2003	35.30					
2004					33	
2005					33	

	<p>FY 2002 because the amount of Federal investment and state matching funds, will remain the same. NIDRR is establishing a target of 33 for FY 2004 and FY 2005. Further analysis of trends and performance outcomes is required to establish baseline data. A revision of the target may be required for use in future years. It is important to point out that the AFP program allows for other, non-loan financing mechanisms. NIDRR will further evaluate the AFP to identify factors that have a potentially adverse effect on the program activities and program performance outcomes. NIDRR will use the results of this evaluation to develop strategies to improve outcomes.</p>	<p>based applicant data collection system that includes the initial applicant survey, the follow-up survey for an approved loan and the follow-up survey for a denied loan. For 2001, the total number of approved loans reported by states was 537 in the program data collection system and 594 in the applicant reporting system. Further evaluation of the data systems is necessary.</p> <p>Improvements: NIDRR will work with the technical assistance grantee for the AFP to improve the reliability of the data used to measure the performance of the AFP by (1) evaluating the two data collection systems, (2) identifying the cause(s) for the differences in the total number of loans reported in the two data collection systems, and (3) modifying the data collection system to address the problems that were identified.</p>
--	--	--

2005PM

Gallaudet University - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.910A - Gallaudet University Programs and Elementary and Secondary Education Programs
84.910B - Gallaudet University Endowment Grant
84.910D - Gallaudet University Construction Program

Goal 8: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing, to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.

Objective 8.1 of 3: The University Programs and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will optimize the number of students completing programs of study .

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain minimum enrollment numbers in Gallaudet's undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs, as well as the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School as established by Gallaudet University.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>University Enrollment</i>							Status: Unable to judge Progress: In fiscal year 2004, the total undergraduate enrollment did not change significantly from last year and remains fairly near the target. Both the graduate student and professional studies enrollment totals appear significantly lower than last year's figures. (See reason in explanation section). The Model Secondary School did not reach its target, however, it maintained at nearly the same level reported in fiscal year 2003. The Kendall School enrollment exceeded its target. Explanation: Gallaudet has changed its system for counting Graduate and Professional Studies students this fiscal year in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture. The University realized that the prior system of calculating enrollment in these areas presented a danger of double counting the same student. Under the new counting method, if a degree-seeking	Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2004 enrollment as of October 2003, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedure applied. Improvements: Gallaudet has implemented a new method for calculating its Graduate and Professional Studies enrollment numbers in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies		
1998	1,339	714	92					
1999	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70		
2000	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70		
2001	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70		
2002	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70		
2003	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70		
2004	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70		
2005				1,250	650	70		
<i>Clerc Center Enrollment</i>								

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		student or a graduate special student is also enrolled in a professional studies course, that student will be counted only once. The new counting method has an impact on both the graduate and professional studies enrollment numbers. The University will continue to implement the new method so that future reports will be comparable. It should also be noted that there was an increase in the number of degree-seeking graduate students this year of 405 compared to last year's figure of 377. Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.	
	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School		
1998	224	137				
1999	209	117	225	140		
2000	219	135	225	140		
2001	205	148	225	140		
2002	188	148	225	140		
2003	190	152	225	140		
2004	186	145	225	140		
2005			225	140		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and increase or maintain the graduate student retention rate.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
University Student Retention Rates - %				Status: Unable to judge		Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate retention rate fell short of its target, while the Graduate student retention rate met its target. Explanation: While the overall Undergraduate retention rate has not changed significantly, the fall to fall persistence for freshmen and transfer students has been increasing by 1 percent each year for the past 5 years. With the continuous improvement of academic support services, it is projected that this 1-2 percent increase will continue and will result in a more visible impact in the next few years. Gallaudet is committed to increased focus on retention of students at all levels and particular attention to the success of first year students.	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate		
1998	72					
1999	73		75			
2000	72	78	76	80		
2001	71	82	76	82		
2002	73	98	76	84		
2003	71	86	79	86		
2004			79	86		
2005			79	86		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the Undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the Graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality

University Students' Graduation Rates - %				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	81
2003	42	82	45	82
2004			45	82
2005			46	83
2006			47	
2007			47	
2008			48	

Clerc Center - Model Secondary School graduation rate - %				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
1998	93			
1999	88		94	
2000	98		94	
2001	90		94	
2002	80		94	
2003	71		94	
2004			94	
2005			94	

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate graduation rate fell short of its target but remained steady with last year's rate. The Graduate student graduation rate met its target. The Model Secondary School graduation rate declined from the previous year and fell short its target (see explanation section).

Explanation: The Undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Consistent with other universities, Gallaudet students are taking longer to complete baccalaureate studies. Gallaudet continues to institute new strategies to improve its Undergraduate graduation rate. In fiscal year 2003, 71 percent of the Model School seniors completed all graduation requirements by the end of their senior year. However, as of this report, an additional 21 percent have deferred graduation until 2004 in order to complete graduation requirements and IEP goals. An additional 2 percent are pending graduation upon completion of required coursework. Therefore, the total projected graduation rate for the fiscal year 2003 senior class is expected to be 94 percent.

Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Collection Period: - 2004

Data Available: October 2004

Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.

Limitations: The Clerc Center (MSSD) graduation rates reported here give an incomplete picture of the graduation status of seniors from fiscal year 2001 onward. There is a need to reconceptualize how performance is assessed to make this indicator a more valid reflection of actual graduation rates. Graduation from MSSD is more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an IEP decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option. Clerc Center personnel are currently in the process of redefining graduation outcomes and indicators at MSSD to reflect progress through school and changes in graduation requirements and program options. The Clerc Center will work with the Department in an effort to propose a revised indicator(s) and performance

		measure(s) to better show MSSD graduation rates.
--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 3: Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Numbers of Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula</i>			Status: Target exceeded Progress: The Clerc Center exceeded its target in fiscal year 2003. Explanation: In fiscal year 2003, 54 programs adopted the Clerc Center's curricula and other products, or modified their strategies as a result of MSSD and KDES leadership. The cumulative number of programs utilizing MSSD/KDES expertise since 1998 is 304 programs. Again, it should be noted that the number of new programs adopting innovations from year to year will vary and depends in part on the number and type of strategies and curricula being disseminated by the Clerc Center and the financial and personnel resources available within other programs to participate in training and implementation activities.	Additional Source Information: Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2003 Annual Report, submitted in January 2004. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	41			
1999	52	41		
2000	62	41		
2001	39	41		
2002	56	41		
2003	54	41		
2004		50		
2005		55		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Curriculum and Extra-Curricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Gallaudet's Bachelor graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Graduates employed or in advanced education or training during first year after graduation - %</i>			Status: Target met Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the targets of students who were either employed or in advanced education or training programs were met	Additional Source Information: University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2002. Frequency: Annually
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Students in	Students in		

	Employed	Advanced Education or Training	Employed	Advanced Education or Training	Explanation: Gallaudet has broken out this indicator to provide the percentages in each category of students, those actually employed and those students who were in advanced education or training programs. In the past, these two categories were combined. Please note that the percents total more than 100 percent because some respondents were employed and undertook a program of advanced education or training in the same year. Advanced education and training includes students enrolled in a Master's or Ph.D. program, a vocational or technical program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school.	Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University
2001	90	38	77	38		
2002	89	49	78	39		
2003	79	40	79	40		
2004			80	40		
2005			81	41		
Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.						
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Model Secondary School graduates in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation (%)					Status: Target exceeded Progress: The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target. Explanation: The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target by 2 percent. This includes fiscal year 2003 MSSD graduates who were engaged in productive activities, including postsecondary education, work, or Vocational Rehabilitation evaluation or training 4 months after June graduation. An additional 15 percent of graduates reported that they were actively involved in looking for work. Key strategies to address this indicator, implemented in fiscal year 2001, have maintained the impact seen in fiscal year 2002 and 2003.	Additional Source Information: Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
2000	74					
2001	72		80			
2002	90		80			
2003	82		80			
2004			80			
2005			81			

2005PM

National Technical Institute for the Deaf - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.908A - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Operations
84.908B - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Endowment Program
84.908C - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Construction Program

Goal 8: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue

Objective 8.1 of 3: Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
Number of students				Status: Target not met Progress: NTID did not achieve its enrollment targets in the Undergraduate program or in the Educational Interpreter program. However, it well exceeded its target in the Graduate/Masters in Special Education program. Explanation: NTID's goal is to maintain a student body of 1,080 undergraduates, 100 Education Interpreters, and 75 Graduate/Master's in Special Education in fiscal year 2004. This goal focuses on the total enrollment as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. The Undergraduate Program and Educational Interpreter program enrollments are below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements. More aggressive recruitment efforts have paid off in the Educational Interpreter Program and NTID expects the same results next year with Undergraduate programs.	Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2004 as of October 2003. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification applied.	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.			Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
1995	1,035	59	10			
1996	1,038	59	27			
1997	1,069	72	32			
1998	1,085	84	36			
1999	1,135	93	50			1,08010050
2000	1,084	77	59			1,08010050
2001	1,089	75	55			1,08010050
2002	1,125	53	60			1,08010075
2003	1,093	65	73			1,08010075
2004	1,064	92	114			1,08010075
2005				1,08010090		

Progress: NTID did not achieve its enrollment targets in the Undergraduate program or in the Educational Interpreter program. However, it well exceeded its target in the Graduate/Masters in Special Education program.

Explanation: NTID's goal is to maintain a student body of 1,080 undergraduates, 100 Education Interpreters, and 75 Graduate/Master's in Special Education in fiscal year 2004. This goal focuses on the total enrollment as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. The Undergraduate Program and Educational Interpreter program enrollments are below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements. More aggressive recruitment efforts have paid off in the Educational Interpreter Program and NTID expects the same results next year with Undergraduate programs.

--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 3: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student graduation rates-%</i>				Status: Target exceeded Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rates for all three categories equaled or exceeded their targets. Explanation: In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rate for students in the sub-baccalaureate programs decreased to 52 percent while the rate for students in the baccalaureate programs increased to 68 percent resulting in an overall graduation rate of 56 percent for all deaf students. The Institute's goal is to maintain or increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs at or above 52 percent in FY 2004 and increase the rate for students in baccalaureate programs.		Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Sub-Overall Baccalaureate Baccalaureate		Sub-Overall Baccalaureate Baccalaureate			
1997	50	50	51			
1998	51	50	57			
1999	53	50	61			
2000	53	50	63	53	51	61
2001	54	50	64	53	51	61
2002	57	54	66	53	52	61
2003	56	52	68	53	52	61
2004				57	52	69
2005				57	52	69
2006				58	53	70
2007				59	53	71
2008				60	54	72

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will meet or exceed established targets.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student retention rates-%</i>				Status: Target exceeded Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the overall performance of 76 percent exceeded its target by 2 percentage points.		Additional Source Information: NTID Registrar office records Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Sub-Overall Baccalaureate Baccalaureate		Sub-Overall Baccalaureate Baccalaureate			

1997	76	85	84			
1998	74	73	81			
1999	74	69	84			
2000	74	69	85	74	73	84
2001	74	68	86	74	74	84
2002	77	72	87	74	74	84
2003	76	70	86	74	74	84
2004				74	74	84
2005				75	74	86

Explanation: The sub-baccalaureate rate of 70 percent was 4 percentage points below the goal, but 2 percentage points above the average of the last three years. This pattern of improvement makes NTID confident that current and new retention strategies will help achieve the target of 74 percent in 2004. Baccalaureate retention rate decreased to 86 percent, but once again surpassed the target of 84 percent, and is only slightly below the rate for hearing freshmen entering the Rochester Institute of Technology (88 percent).

Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with the level of their academic training.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Placement rate-%</i>			<p>Status: Target not met</p> <p>Progress: Data for 2003 is incomplete at this time, but NTID is confident of achieving or coming very close to the goal of 95 percent.</p> <p>Explanation: Placement rate data is reported the year after graduation. Therefore, performance data reported now is data for 2002. The actual rate for 2002 was below the target for 2002. The Institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target but economic conditions have deteriorated to a point where it is affecting students' ability to find permanent placement. Despite the economy, NTID's placement rate remained close to the 90 percent range. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals, who continue their education or who are not seeking employment, for whatever reasons, in the respective years, are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Records for FY 2002</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: October 2004 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	94			
1996	96			
1997	97			
1998	95			
1999	94	95		
2000	90	95		
2001	92	95		
2002	89	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

2005PM

Institutional Development, Title III & Title V - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.031 - Higher Education Institutional Aid
 84.031B - Strengthening HBCU's and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions
 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program
 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities
 84.120A - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

Goal 8: To improve the capacity of Minority-Serving Institutions, that traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Quality: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			Explanation: In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2004 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	Additional Source Information: Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. Frequency: Annually. Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. Limitations: Data are self-reported.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Institutional Management and Fiscal Stability: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management or fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i>		Explanation: In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on a new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2004 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	Additional Source Information: Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. Frequency: Annually. Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. Limitations: Data are self-reported.
Year	Actual Performance		
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			

Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Student Services and Student Outcomes: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services or student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i>		Explanation: In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2004 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	Additional Source Information: Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. Frequency: Annually. Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. Limitations: Data are self-reported.
Year	Actual Performance		
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			

2005PM

Byrd Honors Scholarships Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships

Goal 8: To promote student excellence and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence

Objective 8.1 of 1: BYRD SCHOLARS WILL SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT HIGH RATES.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Completion of postsecondary education programs: Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs within 4 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years</i>			Progress: The data suggests that Byrd recipients are graduating within four years at a rate far exceeding the rate at which all college students complete their education within six years. (about 53%).	Additional Source Information: Annual Performance Report Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by states, which certify the accuracy of the data. Limitations: Data are based on grantee reports of varying quality and accuracy on the number of Byrd Scholars graduating. For example, six states reported more graduates than seniors. In addition, three states reported more graduates than four-year grant recipients. Although these seemingly reporting anomalies are potentially explainable, they do raise questions about the accuracy of the data.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	98	90		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

2005PM

Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.335 - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

Goal 8: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Persistence rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Median percentage of retention rate (1999 Cohort)</i>			Explanation: For the 1999 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through February 2001) and 36 month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through August 2002). These data are presented under 2001 and 2002 -- reflecting the end of the respective performance periods. For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36 month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18 month Performance Report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36 month Performance Report for the period ending August 2005. Data for the upcoming 2005 cohort will be reported in 2007 (18 month report) and 2008 (36 month report).	Additional Source Information: Grantees are required to submit 18-month and 36-month performance reports Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2002 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2001	79				80
2002	85				80
<i>Median percentage of retention rate (2001 cohort)</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003	78				80
2004					80
<i>Median percentage of retention rate (2002) Cohort</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2004					80
2005					80

Median percentage of retention rate (2005) Cohort					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2007					80
2008					80
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who complete postsecondary education.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Median percentage of completion rate (1999 cohort)			<p>Explanation: For the 1999 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through February 2001) and 36 month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through August 2002). These data are presented under 2001 and 2002 -- reflecting the end of the respective performance periods. For the 1999 Cohort an insufficient number of grantees were able to report on completion for inclusion in these tables. For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36 month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18 month Performance Report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36 month Performance Report for the period ending August 2005. Data for the upcoming 2005 cohort will be reported in 2007 (18 month report) and 2008 (36 month report).</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: Grantees are required to submit 18 and 36 month performance reports.</p> <p>Collection Period: 2002 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2002	28				25
Median percentage of completion rate (2001 cohort)					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003	25				30
2004					30
Median percentage of completion rate (2002 cohort)					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2004					30
2005					30
Median percentage of completion rate (2005 cohort)					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2007					30

2008		30		
------	--	----	--	--

2005PM

College Assistance Migrant Program - 2005

Goal 8: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a post secondary education.

Objective 8.1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: CAMP 1st year completion: Eighty-five percent of CAMP participants will successfully complete the first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.</i>			Status: Target not met Progress: The proportion of CAMP students who have completed their 1st year of college remains high at 80% but did not increase. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target.	Additional Source Information: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees. No froman verification procedure has been applied. Improvements: Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education 2004 data Improvement plan
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	82			
2002	80			
2003		82		
2004		83		
2005		85		

Objective 8.2 of 2: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college continue in postsecondary education.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: A Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of CAMP students who after completing first year continue their postsecondary education</i>		Status: Target not met Progress: The proportion of CAMP students	Additional Source Information: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>who, after successfully completing their first year of college then continue their college education continues to remain high at 75 percent. During the 2001-2002 time period this percentage decreased slightly, by 3 percent. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: February 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.</p>
2001	78		
2002	75		
2003		78	
2004		79	
2005		80	

2005PM

TRIO Programs - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.042 - TRIO_Student Support Services
 84.044 - TRIO_Talent Search
 84.047 - TRIO_Upward Bound
 84.047M - TRIO - Upward Bound Math/Science
 84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers
 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement

Goal 8: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 8.1 of 2: INCREASE POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Upward Bound (UB): College Enrollment (percent)</i>				Explanation: The 2005 plan reflects two changes to the performance indicators and targets for the Upward Bound Program. The first change is the elimination of project persistence (length of participation in program) as an indicator since this indicator does not measure program outcomes. The indicator had been selected as an interim measure because the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program found a correlation between length of participation in the program and the educational outcomes of participants. Better measures of program success, however, are now available. The second change is to track separately the effect of the program on higher risk students. This change reflects: (1) the findings of the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program that found the program has significant effects on higher risk students; and (2) recent funding initiatives encouraging Upward Bound projects to serve more higher risk students. With a greater proportion of Upward Bound participant being higher risk students, maintaining the	Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Higher Education. Section: <u>The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations (1997).</u> Additional Source Information: The re-designed Upward Bound performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually since 2000-01. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. The data from the National Evaluation of the Upward Bound Program that provides the baseline data meets the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	
2000	65	34			
2003			65	35	
2004			65	35.50	
2005			65	36	
2006			65	36.50	
2007			65	37	

	<p>current college enrollment rate of 65% demonstrates continual program improvements. The program's effectiveness with higher risk students is expected to increase by ½ of on</p>	<p>and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p>Limitations: The national evaluation is a longitudinal study of program participants and a comparison group selected by random assignment. Data from this study has provided the baseline data on college enrollment rates. Since this longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports will be used to determine if targets are met beginning with the 2002-03 data that should be available in mid to late 2004. It should also be noted that the definition of higher risk student used in the national evaluation is somewhat different than the criteria used by Upward Bound projects funded under the Upward Bound Initiative.</p> <p>Improvements: Status: Data from the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program provides the baseline data (2000 actual performance). The re-designed annual Upward Bound performance report will be used to determine if the performance targets are met for the program overall and the higher risk students. Beginning with the 2001 report for project years 1999-2000 and 2000-01, Upward Bound projects have been submitting individual participant data that can be used to track the academic progress of project participants. Since most Upward Bound participants start in their freshman or sophomore year of high school, a cohort college enrollment rate will be available in late 2004.</p>
--	---	---

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Postsecondary Enrollment: Percentage of Talent Search participants enrolling in college.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Talent Search : College Enrollment (percent)</i>			Explanation: This indicator is being introduced for the first time. The 2000 baseline from the Talent Search Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available.	Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	College Enrollment	College Enrollment		
2000	73			
2001		73		
2002		73		
2003		73		
2004		73.50		
2005		74		
2006		74.50		
2007		75		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>EOC's : College Enrollment (percent)</i>			Explanation: This indicator is being introduced for the first time. The 2000 baseline from the EOC Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available.	Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	57			
2001		57		
2002		57		
2003		57		
2004		57		
2005		57.50		
2006		58		
2007		58.50		

Objective 8.2 of 2: INCREASE POSTSECONDARY PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC

PIPELINE.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Student Support Services (SSS): College persistence (percent) and completion (percent)			<p>Explanation: Data from the national study of the Student Support Services Program provides the baseline data (1999 actual performance). The re-designed Student Support Services' annual performance report has been used to determine if the performance targets for college persistence have been met. The six-year college completion baseline of 29% includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. It has been set at this level because the annual performance reports will only report the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution. Preliminary data show that the graduation rate off SSS participants who were college freshmen in 2001-2002 is 12%. This rate is calculated after four years (not six years as with the baseline data) and does not include those SSS participants who completed an Associate's degree within four years. Thus, we expect the graduation rate to increase as additional years of data become available. The long-term goals for SSS are to increase the persistence and completion rates to 70% and 31%, respectively, by 2007.</p>	<p>Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation: Higher Education. Section: The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations (1997) .</p> <p>Additional Source Information: The re-designed Student Support Services performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. The data from the National Study of the Student Support Services Program that provides the baseline data met the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p>Limitations: The national study was a longitudinal evaluation of program participants and a comparison group. Data from this study has provided the baseline data on persistence and graduation rates. Since this longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports have been used to assess attainment of persistence targets and will be used to determine four-year</p>		
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	College Persistence	College Completion			College Persistence	College Completion
1999	67	29				
2000	67				67	29
2001	70				67	29
2002	72				67	29
2003					68	29.50
2004					68.50	30
2005					69	30.50
2006			69.50	30.50		
2007			70	31		

					graduation rates beginning with the 2001-02 data and six-year graduation dates beginning with the 2003-2004 data that should be available in late 2005.		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
McNair: Graduate school enrollment (percent) and persistence (percent)			Explanation: The 1998-99 annual performance reports provided the baseline data for the McNair program. These annual performance reports have been used to determine if the performance targets for graduate school enrollment and persistence have been met. Performance targets for 2003 and 2004 have been increased to reflected expected program outcomes..		Additional Source Information: The re-designed McNair annual performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually. Additional data will be forthcoming from a national study of the McNair Program. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted. Limitations: The primary data source is the annual performance report that is self-reported data.		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Enrollment	Persistence				Enrollment	Persistence
1999	35	48					
2000	35	75				35	48
2001	40	66				35	48
2002	39	65				35	48
2003						36	70
2004						36	70
2005			36	70			

2005PM

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.116 - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

Goal 8: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and Postsecondary institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others</i>			Explanation: FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 90% or more projects result in project models being adapted on other campuses.	Additional Source Information: Final Report Scorecard Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Similar results from site visit scorecard. Limitations: Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. Have revised form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through PES around these indicators.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003	88	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		
2006		95		
2007		95		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Institutionalization of FIPSE programs

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond Federal funding.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses</i>			Explanation: FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of	Additional Source Information: Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent in at the completion of
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

1998	93		long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. Expect the rate of institutionalization to be in the 90-100% range, but not 100% each year.	projects. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Similar Data from Site Visit Score Card. Assessment of project drawn from on-site visitation and evaluation of projects). Limitations: Data supplied as a result of the assessment of project final reports submitted by project directors. Improvements: Planning modification of assessment to work with planned on-line assessment for 2003. External evaluation of the Comprehensive Program is currently underway
1999	96			
2000	94	100		
2001	100	95		
2002	96	95		
2003	96	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		
2006		95		
2007		95		

2005PM

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.334 - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs
84.334A - GEAR-UP Partnership Grants
84.334S - GEAR-UP State Grants

Goal 8: To significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Completion of academically challenging curricula: Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.</i>				Explanation: Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Target data beginning in 2003 continue to reflect the percentage of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade, and the Algebra 1 standard is now measured via GEAR UP student enrollment rates by the end of the 9th grade. Data beginning in 2004 will be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. Note that standards to enter and complete above grade level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students in many schools served by GEAR UP who are entering and completing such courses. Also Note that data for Year 2001 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2000 - March 2001. Data for Year 2002 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual		Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Prealgebra	Algebra 1	Prealgebra					Algebra 1
2001	18							
2002	18							
2003	22	30	19					19
2004			20					40
2005			25					50
2006			30					60
2007			35					70

	Performance Report covering April 2001 - March 2002. Data for Year 2003 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2002 - March 2003.	
--	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Attendance and promotion: GEAR UP students will have high rates of attendance in school and be promoted to the next grade level on time.																																																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress																																																			
<p><i>Percentage of GEAR UP 7th graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of the academic year.</i></p> <table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Attendance</td><td>Attendance</td></tr> <tr> <td>2001</td><td>83</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2002</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2003</td><td>87</td><td>89</td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>90</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>90</td></tr> <tr> <td>2006</td><td></td><td>91</td></tr> <tr> <td>2007</td><td></td><td>92</td></tr> </table> <p><i>Percentage of GEAR UP 7th graders promoted to the next grade level.</i></p> <table> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Promotion</td><td>Promotion</td></tr> <tr> <td>2001</td><td>98</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2002</td><td>97</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>2003</td><td>98</td><td>97</td></tr> <tr> <td>2004</td><td></td><td>97</td></tr> <tr> <td>2005</td><td></td><td>97</td></tr> <tr> <td>2006</td><td></td><td>98</td></tr> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Attendance	Attendance	2001	83		2002	88		2003	87	89	2004		90	2005		90	2006		91	2007		92	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Promotion	Promotion	2001	98		2002	97		2003	98	97	2004		97	2005		97	2006		98	<p>Explanation: Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP 7th graders with fewer than 5 unexcused absences in the first 2 quarters of the academic year and those promoted to the next grade level. Data will continue to be collected on school attendance and grade level promotions. Note that standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR UP programs.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																																			
	Attendance	Attendance																																																			
2001	83																																																				
2002	88																																																				
2003	87	89																																																			
2004		90																																																			
2005		90																																																			
2006		91																																																			
2007		92																																																			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																																			
	Promotion	Promotion																																																			
2001	98																																																				
2002	97																																																				
2003	98	97																																																			
2004		97																																																			
2005		97																																																			
2006		98																																																			
		<p>Sources and Data Quality</p> <p>Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>																																																			

2007		98		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: High school graduation and participation in postsecondary education: GEAR UP students will have high rates of high school graduation and postsecondary education enrollment.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of GEAR UP students who have completed high school.			Explanation: Data will be collected in future years on GEAR UP students' high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment.	Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study. Collection Period: 2007 - 2008 Data Available: December 2008 Validated By: No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2008		70		
2009		72		
2010		73		
Percentage of former GEAR UP students who are enrolled in college.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2008		60		
2009		62		
2010		65		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase GEAR UP students' and their families' knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Knowledge of postsecondary education: GEAR UP students and their families reporting having knowledge of available financial aid and necessary academic preparation for college.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of parents of GEAR UP students that have knowledge of available financial aid.</i>			Explanation: Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP students and their parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements; as well as the percentages of GEAR UP students' parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about availability of financial assistance. Data will continue to be collected on students and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements	Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid		
2001	24			
2002	31			
2003	35	32		
2004		33		

2005		35	costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.	
2006		37		
2007		40		
Percentage of GEAR UP students and their families that have knowledge of necessary academic preparation for college.				
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep		Students: Prep Parents: Prep
2001	50	31		
2002	53	39		
2003	57	43		54 40
2004				56 42
2005			61 46	
2006			66 48	
2007			75 50	

2005PM

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

Goal 8: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level

Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing the terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Graduate School Completion: Increase the percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain the terminal degree in an area of national need.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of GAANN fellows completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need will increase over time.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Progress: The baseline for this indicator will be established in December 2004. Upon establishing the base line, performance target will be set for 2005. Explanation: The program office is in the process of developing a database to collect this information. Upon receipt of the GAANN data, we plan to draw a comparison to a national representation group. Data from 1999 and 2001 are not comparable as 2001 was the first year that the number reflects reporting from a cohort of grantees. No data is expected for the old (and now deleted measures) in fiscal years 2002 and 2003. Data from first cohort using the new measure is expected in December 2004. Cohort data is presented 7 years after program participation begins.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	60			
2001	12	12		
2004		999		
2005		999		

											Data available in December 04 and will be reported early 2005. 2005 Target of "999" represents "Maintain baseline." 2004 Target of "999" means "Establish baseline."		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Enrollment of Underrepresented Populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated area of national need will increase over time.													
Targets and Performance Data											Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need will increase over time.													
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets					<p>Status: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: Performance reports are due December 2003 and data will be available March 2004.</p> <p>Explanation: Data for fiscal years 2002-2004 not expected as this measure was not in place during those years. Measure was used in 1999 and 2000, deleted in 2002-2004, and restored in 2005. Data Available in December 04 and will be reported early 2005</p> <p>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding</p>		
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women [Empty]	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women [Empty]			
1999	1	10	7	4	37								
2001	0	7	7	7	39	1	7	7	6	38			
2005						1	8	7	6	39			

				fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Time to completion.: The median duration of time from entering graduate school until degree completion will be less than that of comparable doctoral students as identified annually in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Time to Degree Completion: Assess that time to Degree completion is less than for comparable non-GAANN recipients.</i>			Progress: The baseline for this indicator will be established in December 2004. Explanation: The program office is in the process of developing a database to collect this information. Upon receipt of the GAANN data, we plan to draw a comparison to a national representative group.	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Collecting Agency: NSF. Survey/Research Report Title: Survey of Earned Doctorate. References: . Additional Source Information: Program Administrative Records Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		7.40		
2005		7.40		

2005PM

International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.015 - National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program for Language and Area or Language and International Studies
84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy

Goal 8: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Maintain a US Higher Education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of US Government, academic and business institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Course Offerings: The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.</i>		Explanation: Data will be collected for FY 2004 and will be available in 2005.	Additional Source Information: Program Information Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: 2005
Year	Actual Performance		
2005		Performance Targets	
		20,000	
Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Instructional Materials: The number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of comprehensive instructional resources produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.</i>		Explanation: Data will be collected for FY 2004 and will be available in 2005.	Additional Source Information: Program Information Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: 2005
Year	Actual Performance		
2005		Performance Targets	
		90	
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Teacher Training: The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright Hays Programs.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright Hays Programs</i>			Additional Source Information: Program Information

<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>5,000</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		5,000	Explanation: Data will be collected for FY 2004 and will be available in 2005.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		5,000						
Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Employment: The percentage of Title VI graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality					
<i>Title VI graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.</i>		Explanation: Data will be collected for FY 2004 and will be available in 2005.	Additional Source Information: Program Information Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: 2005					
<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>50</td></tr></table>	Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		50
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
2005		50						

2005PM

Javits Fellowship Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships

Goal 8: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement and exceptional promise

Objective 8.1 of 1: TO ENABLE STUDENTS OF SUPERIOR ABILITY IN THE ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES TO COMPLETE THEIR TERMINAL DEGREE.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment</i>			Explanation: The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for. The program office is in the process of developing a database to collect this information. Upon receipt of the GAANN data, we plan to draw a comparison to a national representative group	Additional Source Information: Program performance reports, 2002; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: The new Annual Performance Report will require grantees to report completion data on their fellows (thus obtaining completion information on both doctoral programs and those programs where the Master of Fine Arts is the terminal degree).
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	30			
1999	26			
2003		29		
2004		30		
2005		30		

2005PM

Student Financial Assistance Policy - 2005

Goal 8: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Percentage of unmet need: The percentage of unmet need considering all sources of financial aid, especially for low-income students.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
Percentage of Unmet Need for Undergraduates						Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Data Available: January 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: NPSAS data are collected only every four years.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
1995	23							
1996	23							
1997	22							
1998	21.20							
1999	20.80							
2000	21.20							
2003			19.20					
2004			19.20					
2005			19.20					
Percentage of Unmet Need for Low Income Undergraduates.								
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Dependent	Independent Without Kids	Independent With Kids	Dependent	Independent Without Kids	Independent With Kids		
1996	46.30	54.70	52.50					
1997	44.50	51.60	49					
1998	42.90	51.10	49					
1999	41.80	50.20	48.50					

2000	43.10	60.60	46.20					
2003				41.10	58.60	44.20		
2004				41.10	58.60	44.20		
2005				41.10	58.60	44.20		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates for all students, and the enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates.								
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality	
The percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total							Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: April 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates. Three-year weighted averages are used to smooth out these fluctuations.	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
1995	61.90							
1996	65							
1997	67							
1998	65.60							
1999	62.90							
2000	63.30							
2001	61.70							
2003			65					
2004			67					
2005			67					
The Percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college by income.								
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference		
1995	41.20	83.40	42.20					
1996	41.50	78	36.50					
1997	47.10	82	34.90					

1998	50.60	77.30	26.70			
1999	50.90	76	25.10			
2000	48.50	77.10	28.60			
2001	47.80	79.80	32			
2003				50	80	30
2004				52	81	29
2005				52	81	29

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.</i>			Explanation: Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students.		Source: Other Other: Record/File. Sponsor: Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
1997	82					
1998	80					
1999	78	75				
2000	78	75				
2001		75				
2002		75				
2003		75				
2004		75				
2005		75				

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of prepayment will be less than 10 percent.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The median federal debt burden of students in their first full year of repayment.</i>			Explanation: As a general rule, it is believed that an educational debt burden of 10 percent or		Additional Source Information: National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) records.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				

1998	7.10	
1999	6.48	
2000	6.38	
2003		9.90
2004		9.90
2005		9.90

greater will negatively affect a borrower's ability to repay his or her student loan and to obtain other credit such as a home mortgage. We expect the 2001 and 2002 median debt burden rate to remain well below 10 percent.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2000 - 2001
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: To overcome limitations with the data from the Social Security Administration (SSA) that were previously used, we switched to IRS data on household income for 1998 and future years. The IRS data may slightly understate debt burden for married borrowers where both individuals have student loans. Additionally, IRS data requires at least 2 years to become available to the department.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year and less-than-4-year programs; and the gap in completion rates between minority and non-minority students.

Targets and Performance Data								Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a 4-year degree within 150% of the normal time required.</i>									<p>Additional Source Information: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>Limitations: Prior to the implementation of the GRS, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students and 77 percent of 2-year students.</p>
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets		
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total		
1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40			
1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70			
1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10			
2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90			

2003		54
2004		55
2005		55
The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a less than 4-year program within 150% of the normal time required.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Total Black White Hispanic Difference between Black and White Difference between White and Hispanic	Total
1997	30.90 22.80 32.60 26.20 9.80 6.40	
1998	32.20 25.10 33.80 29.90 8.70 3.90	
1999	34.40 29.50 35.30 32.50 5.80 2.80	
2000	32.70 26.50 34 30.10 7.50 3.90	
2003		34
2004		35
2005		35

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that taxpayers will have a positive return on investment in the federal student financial assistance programs.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Return on investment: The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs.								
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Return on Investment</i>				Explanation: The column titles are defined as follows. Low: A pessimistic set of assumptions leading to a low-end estimate of the return on investment. Best: The set of assumptions that we believe best captures the return on investment. High: An optimistic set of assumptions leading to a high-end estimate of the return on investment. The estimated return on investment is calculated in the following manner: 1) The discounted present value of tax revenue and welfare benefits	Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research Additional Source Information: March Current Population Survey (CPS) and Beginning Post Secondary (BPS) study with imputations from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and High School and Beyond (HS&B). Behavioral assumptions were derived, where feasible, from meta-analyses			
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets		
	Low	Best	High			Low	Best	High
1996	1.30	2.90	6.70					
1997	1.30	2.80	6.50					
1998	1.30	2.90	6.70					
1999	1.40	3.10	7.10					

2000	1.50	3.30	7.70	
2001	1.60	3.40	8	
2003			1.60	3.40 8
2004			1.60	3.40 8
2005			1.60	3.40 8

is calculated for different educational attainment levels. 2) Under the “best” scenario, 90 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 1 is assumed to be caused by obtaining more education.

conducted by Leslie and Brinkman in their 1988 book, *The Economic Value of Higher Education*.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: A number of assumptions and imputations are required to estimate the return on investment. By providing high and low estimates, one can assess the sensitivity of the results to the assumptions used. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

2005PM

Student Financial Assistance Programs - 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program
84.037 - Perkins Loan Cancellations
84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program_Federal Capital Contributions
84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program
84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

Goal 8: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Objective 8

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Reduce or Maintain FSA Business Process Unit Cost

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Unit Cost of Application Processing			<p>Progress: FSA did not meet its goal for FY 2003 to have baseline unit costs defined for the business processes referenced. FSA has completed defining and validating the ABC methodology that it will use. In addition, reporting has been redesigned to address GAO concerns as well as the current needs of FSA. However additional work is required from FSA subject matter specialist to allocate baseline resource data, prior to using the ABC information. This effort will continue in FY 2004 and will be accomplished by the end of the year.</p> <p>Explanation: By the end of FY 2004, we will develop baseline unit cost measures for the business processes referenced. (In the table, the code 9999 represents setting a baseline.) FSA's target for FY 2005 is to maintain the baseline set by the end of FY 2004. (This is shown as code 999 in the table to the left.)</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. The model is currently under construction with a target date of September 2004.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: September 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		
2005		999		
Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		
2005		999		
Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		
2005		999		

<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2003		9,999
2005		999
<i>Unit Cost of Default Collections</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2003		9,999
2005		999

2005PM

Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - 2005

Goal 8: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Objective 8.1 of 2: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF-BLIND RECEIVE THE SPECIALIZED SERVICES AND TRAINING THEY NEED TO BECOME AS INDEPENDENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: By 2008, the training program at headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45% or less restrictive setting outcomes to 75%.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
% of adult consumers placed in employment and those in less restrictive settings.						Status: Target not met Explanation: In the year 2003, 40 of the 83 individuals who terminated training had a desire to achieve a vocational outcome. Of this 40, 17 or 42.5% achieved this goal. Of the remaining 23, 22 were home seeking competitive or supported employment and 1 is participating in sheltered employment. Among the 20 individuals not seeking a vocational outcome, 3 received short-term training in adaptive technology, 6 were homemakers, 2 attended college, 2 attended other voc/training programs, 3 are deceased and 4 discontinued training. In addition, HKNC served 13 high school and 10 senior citizen consumers in 2003. Of the 23 consumers who terminated the program with a desire to move to less restrictive living situations, 16 or 70% achieved this goal. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included for the percentage placed in less restrictive settings.		Additional Source Information: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 200 - 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Final transition plans on each client will include the employment and living situations each client will be entering upon completion of training. Limitations: Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. A follow-up survey was developed but budgetary limitations prevented it implementation. HKNC will conduct a limited survey using selected RSA regions.		
Year		Actual Performance		Performance Targets						
	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings					% Placed in Employment Settings
1999	75		45	85						38
2000	82		52	90						45
2001	87	71	38	90	59					45
2002	85	80	27	90	59					45
2003	100	70	42.50	90	59					45
2004				95	70					45
2005				95	70					45
2006				95	70					45
2007				95	75					45
2008				95	75					45
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: To increase the percentage of training goals achieved by consumers participating in the training program.										
Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		

Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants			Status: Target exceeded Explanation: Consumers come to HKNC with training goals that go beyond those reported in indicator 1.1. This indicator represents the percent of training goals achieved by all adult consumers served during the program year. These measurable, instructional objectives are mutually developed by the consumers and their instructors. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included.	Additional Source Information: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Limitations: Data is based upon self-reported data from the grantee and is not independently verified.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	92	86		
2002	90	86		
2003	88	86		
2004		88		
2005		88		
2006		88		
2007		90		
2008		90		

Objective 8.2 of 2: ENSURE THAT DEAF-BLIND CONSUMERS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS RECEIVE THE SERVICES THEY NEED TO FUNCTION MORE INDEPENDENTLY IN THE HOME COMMUNITY.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Regional services to consumers and families: Helen Keller National Center will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number served through Helen Keller National Center				Status: Target exceeded Progress: In 2002, the regional offices served more consumers, families and organizations than were targeted. Explanation: The number of consumers and families served fluctuates from year to year. In establishing the targets, trend data were used from prior years.	Additional Source Information: HKNC Annual Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 Data Available: October 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. HKNC regional reps maintain client case summary files that indicate re activity with individual consumers, family members, professionals and organizations/agencies. Limitations: Client case summary reports do not measure the level of service provided or impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members. There are no improvements planned at this time.
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
	Consumers	Families	Organizations	Consumers Families Organizations	
1999	1,336	368	976	1,250 400	
2000	1,340	461	995	1,300 400 950	
2001	1,727	484	913	1,400 425 1,000	
2002	1,932	487	1,090	1,500 400 1,050	
2003	1,982	611	1,288	1,700 450 1,050	
2004				1,700 450 1,050	
2005				1,700 450 1,050	

2005PM

Howard University - 2005

Goal 8: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Objective 8.1 of 3: MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND ACHIEVEMENT BY (1) RECRUITING BETTER STUDENTS, (2) IMPROVING STUDENT RETENTION, (3) IMPROVING GRADUATION RATES, AND (4) PROMOTING EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshmen will increase by 1 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality					
Average SAT score					<div>Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004</div>				<div>Additional Source Information: Howard University</div> <div>Frequency: Annually.</div> <div>Collection Period: 2003</div> <div>Data Available: March 2004</div> <div>Validated By: No Formal Verification.</div>					
Year	Actual Performance										Performance Targets			
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change							Math	Verbal	Total	% Change
1997	494	513	1,007											
1998	506	519	1,025	1.80										
1999	517	533	1,050	2.40									1,035	
2000	525	537	1,062	1.10									1,061	2.50
2001	516	530	1,046	-1.50									1,073	1.10
2002	534	545	1,079	3.20									1,056	-1.60
2003	537	544	1,081	.20									1,090	3.20
2004							1,092	.20						

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Attrition rates</i>				Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004	Additional Source Information: The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange. Howard University. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	% National Rate	% HU Rate	%		
1997	26.70	19.60			
1998	26.40	17.60			
1999	25	16			

2000		20	15.10	15			
2001		20.20	12.90	14.80			
2002		21	14.90	12.60			
2003		32.70	14.90	14.60			
2004				14.60			
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.							
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
6-year graduation rate					Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004	Additional Source Information: Howard University Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: The reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate					
1997		49					
1998		40.90					
1999	54.20	46.10		43			
2000	54.10	48.70		48			
2001	54.90	51.30		50			
2002	54	48.80		52			
2003		54.80		52			
2004				55			
Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The number of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.							
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Number of proposals					Explanation: The principal goals for the Fund for Academic Excellence include: 1) serving as a catalyst for increasing extramural research; 2) improving the quality of teaching and learning; and 3) encouraging new and junior faculty to participate in seeking institutional focused research. 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004	Additional Source Information: Howard University Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Submitted	Funded	Number of Participants	Funded			Number of Participants
1998	258	153	189				
1999	218	152	200				

2000	149	128	173	125	210
2001	154	130	160	140	200
2002	258	163	292	150	225
2003	222	169	160	240	230
2004				240	

Objective 8.2 of 3: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of grant proposals</i>			Explanation: Targets for 2005 will be set in March 2004.	Additional Source Information: Howard University. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	232			
1998	279			
1999	299			
2000	252	301		
2001	261	260		
2002	250	270		
2003	313	275		
2004		315		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Funds received through research grants</i>			Explanation: Targets for 2005 will be set in March 2004.	Additional Source Information: Howard University. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Value of Grants Received % Change	Value of Grants Received % Change		
1997	45.268.427			

1998	44,057,827	-2.70		
1999	47,533,841	7.90		
2000	50,294,706	5.80	48,009,180	20
2001	53,416,128	6.20	51,700,000	7.70
2002	63,000,000	17.90	53,800,000	4.10
2003	65,608,032	4.10	65,000,000	20.80
2004			70,200,000	8

Objective 8.3 of 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 4: Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Market value of endowment (in millions)</i>				Additional Source Information: Howard University & the Chronicle of Higher Education. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	211.20			
1998	252.90			
1999	297			
2000	329.30	320		
2001	340.90	346		
2002	323.70	347		
2003	326.50	348		
2004		349		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 4: Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Alumni contribution (in millions)</i>			Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004.	Additional Source Information: Howard University. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	11.80			

<div>19988.40</div> <div>19999.20</div> <div>200013.9011</div> <div>200118.4014.50</div> <div>200218.3018</div> <div>200342.4020</div> <div>200445</div>			<div>Validated By: No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.</div>		
Indicator 8.3.3 of 4: Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
Participation rate		<div>Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004.</div>		<div>Additional Source Information: Howard University.</div> <div>Frequency: Annually.</div> <div>Collection Period: 2003</div> <div>Data Available: March 2004</div> <div>Validated By: No Formal Verification.</div>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
1998	11.40				
1999	9.40				
2000	12.20				25
2001	15		30		
2002	18		32		
2003	20		20.50		
2004		23			
Indicator 8.3.4 of 4: Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Net Revenue		<div>Explanation: 2005 Targets will be set in March 2004.</div>	<div>Additional Source Information: Howard University</div> <div>Frequency: Annually.</div> <div>Collection Period: 2003</div> <div>Data Available: March 2004</div> <div>Validated By: No Formal Verification.</div>		
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
1997	170,084,807				
1998	183,789,977				
1999	204,360,845				
2000	213,879,600			184,510,111	

2001	216,598,823	193,735,617
2002	225,252,566	203,422,397
2003	214,206,000	226,394,000
2004		244,340,000
<i>Total Expense</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	209,761,348	
1998	211,689,178	
1999	234,841,266	
2000	246,819,944	225,813,215
2001	242,028,727	237,103,876
2002	252,072,279	248,959,070
2003	258,656,000	234,286,000
2004		243,484,000

2005PM

Client Assistance Program (CAP) - 2005

Goal 8: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended

Objective 8.1 of 2: Resolve cases at lowest possible level

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of cases resolved through ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.</i>			Explanation: A more accurate method of calculation, beginning with FY 2001 data, utilizes a more expansive definition of ADR-related services. A baseline rate of 84% and performance targets have been established based on FY 2001 and 2002 data.	Additional Source Information: CAP performance report, RSA-227. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: April 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. On-site compliance reviews are conducted and random sampling of on site files is cross-checked with reported data for verification. Limitations: The collection instrument does not contain known data limitations.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	84			
2002	85			
2003		84		
2004		84		
2005		84		
2006		84		
2007		84		
2008		84		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the rehabilitation act.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of CAPs reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>			Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source Information: CAP FY 2002 performance report, RSA-

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Explanation: Performance percentage based on reporting of successful systemic change activity by 30 out of 56 CAPs. A baseline of 43% was established in FY 1999.</p>	<p>227, narrative section.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: April 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>
1998	50.90			
1999	43			
2000	44	44		
2001	45	45		
2002	54	46		
2003		48		
2004		49		
2005		50		
2006		52		
2007		54		
2008		55		

2005PM

Independent Living Services Program - 2005

CFDA Numbers:

84.132 - Centers for Independent Living
84.169 - Independent Living State Grants
84.177B - Services for Older Blind Individuals

Goal 8: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals, served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the number of individuals with disabilities who live independently in community-based housing.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Increase the percentage of designated State units (DSUs) and Centers for Independent Living (CILs) that exceed their previous year's total for moving individuals with disabilities from long-term care facilities and other institutions to community-based housing.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of DSUs and CILs that exceed previous year's total for moving individuals with disabilities from long-term care facilities and other institutions to community-based housing.</i>			Explanation: Performance in FY 2003 data will become the baseline for future performance targets.	Additional Source Information: Source: RSA Annual Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increase the number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institutions for community-based living due to independent living services provided by a CIL.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institution for community-based living due to services provided by a CIL.</i>			Progress: RSA/IL has been counting this measure for several years. Trend data from FY 2000-2003 suggest that CILs have been successful in increasing by about 10 percent per year the number of individuals moved from long-term care facilities or other institutions to community-based housing. Future performance targets have been increased 10 percent per year.	Additional Source Information: RSA Annual Performance Report. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: March 2004 Improvements: The instructions contained in the 704 reports have been revised to ensure that reporting for this measure is valid across grantees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	1,372	850		
2001	1,777	900		
2002	2,012	900		
2003		2,213		
2004		2,434		

2005		2,677		
------	--	-------	--	--

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of individuals from underserved populations assisted by the Older Blind program relative to their representation in the general population in the State.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Older blind individuals served by the program: States will increase the percentage of DSUs that meet the needs of elderly underserved populations.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of DSUs whose older blind population served reflects the general demographic profile of the State.</i>			Explanation: Explanation: This is a new measure for the OB program. Therefore, FY 2002 is the baseline year. Each subsequent year will increase by 1 percent.	Additional Source Information: Annual 7-OB reports. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: March 2004 Review of 7-OB reports by regional staff.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		999		
2003		1		
2004		1		
2005		1		

2005PM

Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.240 - Program of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights

Goal 8: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Policy changes: By FY 2008, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 82%.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of PAIRs reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: Actual performance percentage based on 46 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities in FY 2002. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2002.	Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report. Program: RSA Form 509. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: April 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists. Limitations: Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	54			
2001	68			
2002	81			
2003		75		
2004		77		
2005		79		
2006		80		
2007		81		
2008		82		

2005PM

Demonstration and Training Programs - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training_Special Demonstration Programs

Goal 8: To expand, improve or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act

Objective 8.1 of 1: EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES THAT LEAD TO EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Expansion: Projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies that contribute to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities according to the percentage of individuals served and placed into employment by the projects.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment</i>			Status: Unable to judge Progress: Progress in expanding the services that contribute to the employment of individuals with disabilities through Special Demonstration Programs will be based on an increased percentage of individuals placed into employment for each year that is reported. Explanation: This is a new measure that establishes a baseline of 999 in fiscal year 2001, with an anticipated increase of 1% for each succeeding fiscal year. A total of 45 projects are funded through the Special Demonstrations program. Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Reports Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2001 - 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. Limitations: The web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data, but does not aggregate the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required. Improvements: The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to correct this problem.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percent of individuals placed into employment	Percent of individuals placed into employment		
2001	20	999		
2002		21		
2003		22		
2004		23		
2005		24		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improvement: It is anticipated that the impact of interactions, presentations and information made to and by State VR agencies will increase referral of individuals to or from VR Agencies, thereby expanding service provision.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of referrals to and from VR and projects.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects
2001	9	29	999	999
2002			10	30
2003			11	31
2004			12	32
2005			13	33

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress will be based on a long term measurement of relationship of the projects to the Vocational Rehabilitation system.

Explanation: This is a new measure that establishes a baseline of 999 for fiscal year 2001, with an anticipated increase of 1% for each succeeding fiscal year. A total of 45 projects are funded through the Special Demonstrations program.

Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.

Limitations: The web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data, but does not aggregate the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.

Improvements: The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to remedy this problem.

2005PM

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services_American Indians with Disabilities

Goal 8: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible American Indians with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment outcomes consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2008, at least 65 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes.			<p>Progress: Preliminary data obtained from the 10/1/02-9/30/03 collection period indicates a 66% success rate.</p> <p>Explanation: This is the first year that a web-based system is in place for collection of data through the annual report. Not all grantees reported for this period and, of those who did, some information appears to be missing. Thus, the success rate percentage may change when all data is received and apparent errors are corrected. As grantees gain more experience with the new reporting form and begin to collect and keep the data that RSA needs, the data should become a good predictor of results. This may occur in a few years, but is not in place now. It also appears that projects are not using the same criteria for closure of cases. RSA may need to consider changing the performance measure or adding performance measures for this indicator as a result.</p>	<p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 Data Available: December 2004 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data is supplied by project grantees and no formal verification procedure has been applied.</p> <p>Limitations: RSA staff must contact grantees regarding missing or apparently inconsistent data. This is a time consuming process.</p> <p>Improvements: Continued technical assistance will ensure that grantees are providing uniform data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	58			
1999	61			
2000	62	61		
2001	65	62		
2002	66	62		
2003		64		
2004		64		
2005		65		
2006		65		
2007		65		
2008		65		

2005PM

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Supported Employment - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.126 - Rehabilitation Services_Vocational Rehabilitation Grants to States

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 8.1 of 2: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO ARE SERVED BY THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (VR) STATE GRANT PROGRAM ACHIEVE EMPLOYMENT CONSISTENT WITH THEIR PARTICULAR STRENGTHS, RESOURCES, ABILITIES, CAPABILITIES, AND INTERESTS.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies that assist at least 55.8% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes; and (b) State VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage obtaining employment for general and combined VR agencies			Explanation: This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.2, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 55.8 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 68.9 percent. In FY 2001, 75 percent of agencies achieved these rates. The FY 2005 targets were based on FY 2001 performance, the last year for which we have clean data. RSA's goal under GPRA is to increase the percentage	Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	75	78		
2003		81		
2004		83		
2005		85		
Percentage obtaining employment for VR agencies for the blind				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		78		
2003		81		
2004		83		

2005		87	of agencies that pass this indicator.	quickly.
Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies that assist at least 72.6 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) State VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 50 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage obtaining competitive employment for general and combined VR agencies.			Explanation: This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies that are currently performing poorly. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.3, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 35.4 percent was too low a target, and we therefore used 50 percent for the agencies for the blind instead. In FY 2001, 91 percent of general/combined agencies achieved the rate of 72.6 percent, while 79 percent of agencies for the blind achieved the rate of 50 percent. The FY 2005 targets were based on FY 2001 performance, the last year for which we have clean data. RSA's goal under GPRA is to increase the percentage of agencies that pass this indicator.	Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	96	91		
2003		92		
2004		93		
2005		94		
Percentage obtaining competitive employment for VR agencies for the blind.				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		81		
2003		83		
2004		85		
2005		87		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Percentage of competitively employed individuals who have significant disabilities: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies for which at least 65 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities; and (b) State VR agencies for the blind for which at least 89 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage with significant disabilities for general and combined VR agencies				Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911

<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td>93</td><td>91</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td></td><td>92</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>93</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>94</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	93	91	2003		92	2004		93	2005		94	<p>Explanation: This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies that are currently performing poorly. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.4, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 62.4 percent was too low a target for general/combined agencies, and we therefore used 65 percent instead. In FY 2001, 91 percent of general/combined agencies achieved a rate of 65 percent, while 83 percent of agencies for the blind achieved a rate of 89 percent. The FY 2005 targets were based on FY 2001 performance, the last year for which we have clean data. RSA's goal under GPRA is to increase the percentage of agencies that pass this indicator.</p>	<p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2002	93	91															
2003		92															
2004		93															
2005		94															
<p><i>Percentage with significant disabilities for VR agencies for the blind.</i></p>																	
<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td></td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td></td><td>87</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>89</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>91</td></tr></table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002		85	2003		87	2004		89	2005		91	<p>Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2002		85															
2003		87															
2004		89															
2005		91															

<p>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment (long-term): By 2008: (a) 75 percent of general and combined State VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) 60 percent of State VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.</p>																							
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																				
<p><i>Percentage of general and combined State VR agencies assisting at least 85 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment</i></p>		<p>Explanation: This long-term indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.3, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this long-term GPRA indicator, we felt that these rates were too</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p>																				
<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Actual Performance</th><th>Performance Targets</th></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td></td><td>63</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td></td><td>65</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>69</td></tr><tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>71</td></tr><tr><td>2007</td><td></td><td>73</td></tr></table>	Year		Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002		63	2003		65	2004		67	2005		69	2006		71	2007		73	<p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																				
2002			63																				
2003			65																				
2004			67																				
2005			69																				
2006			71																				
2007		73																					
		<p>Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon</p>																					

2008		75
<i>Percentage of State VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002		43
2003		45
2004		48
2005		51
2006		54
2007		57
2008		60

low. Therefore, we set a rate of 85 percent for general/combined agencies and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. In FY 2001, 62.5 percent of general/combined agencies achieved a rate of 85 percent, while 41.7 percent of agencies for the blind achieved a rate of 65 percent. The FY 2008 targets were based on FY 2001 performance, the last year for which we have clean data. RSA's goal under GPRA is to increase the percentage of agencies that perform well on this critical indicator.

counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

Objective 8.2 of 2: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DISABILITIES WHO HAVE RECEIVED SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT SERVICES BUT ACHIEVE COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: Increase the percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better).		
Targets and Performance Data		
<i>Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	69.60	
1998	69.10	
1999	73.30	71
2000	77.30	71.50
2001	79.20	77.40
2002		77.60
2003		77.80

Explanation: This indicator has been a GPRA indicator for a number of years. With this indicator, RSA examines State agency performance regarding supported employment for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Individuals in supported employment can achieve competitive employment (with wages at or above the minimum wage), although not all individuals in supported employment do achieve these competitive wages. RSA wants to encourage State agencies to help individuals with disabilities in supported employment to achieve these competitive employment outcomes. FY 2005 targets were based on FY 2001 performance, the last year for which we have

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80

2004		78	clean data.	grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.
2005		80		

2005PM

Training Program - 2005

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

Goal 7: Special Education and Rehab. Services Internal Goal.

Goal 8: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff.

Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide graduates who work within the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable per constant \$1 million invested.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Scholars supported</i>			Explanation: Since FY 2000, data are based on actual numbers using the new electronic reporting system. Previous numbers were based on estimates made from a small number of prospects. For FY 2001 data, the system has been refined to collect more accurate data.	Additional Source Information: Annual grantee reporting Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2001 - Data Available: March 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	1,600			
1998	1,550			
1999	1,665	1,473		
2000	2,390	2,000		
2001	2,540	2,000		
2002		2,000		
2003		2,050		
2004		2,050		
2005		2,100		
<i>Scholars graduating</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	800			

1998	817			
1999	832	729		
2000	764	688		
2001	841	700		
2002		700		
2003		725		
2004		725		
2005		725		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage			Explanation: 2002 data will be reported by grantees in December 2003.	Additional Source Information: Annual grantee reporting form. Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2001 - Data Available: March 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. Limitations: We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. Same as indicator 1.1
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	72	70		
2001	71	71		
2002		72		
2003		72		
2004		74		
2005		73		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percent of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards</i>			Explanation: 2002 data provided our first comprehensive and systematic approach to collecting this information. Previous performance	Additional Source Information: Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

2000	69		data were estimates based on partial data and, therefore, targets have been revised accordingly.	Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: August 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001	71	70		
2002	65	75		
2003		77		
2004		69		
2005		72		

2005PM

Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions - 2005

Goal 8: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian Community.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that vocational students served in tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: An increasing percentage of vocational education students in the TCPVIP will receive an AA degree or certificate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an AA degree or certificate.</i>				<p>Additional Source Information: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: June 2005 Validated By: No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Limitations: Calculations of completion are based on degree completers relative to all students available to graduate (i.e.; students in their final semester).</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students		
1999	23			
2000	57	25		
2001	82	59		
2002	46	65		
2003	48	47		
2004		49		
2005		52		

2005PM

All Goals

Office for Civil Rights - 2005

Goal 8: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide high quality customer service throughout the case resolution process.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer Response: Based on an OCR customer service evaluation, respondents will indicate a satisfaction rate above the FY 2004 baseline.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of respondents satisfied with OCR's customer service.</i>			Progress: Baseline will be established in FY 2004. FY 2005 target will be baseline + 5%	Additional Source Information: In FY 2004, OCR will develop a system to collect, analyze, monitor and report customer service data. Data are collected during the fiscal year (October 1 - September 30). Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Survey validation method TBD
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		5		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Resolution of Complaints: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.</i>				Additional Source Information: Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1- September 30). Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2004 - 2005 Data Available: October 2005 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	80			
1998	81			
1999	80	80		
2000	78	80		
2001	84	80		
2002	89	80		

2003	91	80		
2004		80		
2005		80		

2005PM